National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT....WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 14. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 26, 1852. WHOLE NO. 638.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.

Pro-Slavery.

REPORT ON SLAVERY.

[Made by Rev. J. H. THORNWELL, D. D., to the Presbyterian (Old School) Assembly, at its last session, in Charleston, S. C.]

It will be remembered that at the sessions of this Synod in Columbia, in 1847, a series of resolutions was presented, setting forth the relations of the Church to Slavery, and the duties respectively of master and servant. After some discussion, it was deemed advisable to appoint a committee to take the whole subject into consideration, and submit a report, somewhat in the form of a circular letter, to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth, explaining the position of Southern Christians, and vindicating their right to the confidence, love and fellowship of all who everywhere call upon our common Master. The design of appointing this committee was not to increase, but to allay agitation. It was evident that a strong public sentiment, both in Europe and America, had been organized, and was daily growing in intensity, against institutions which we had inherited from our fathers, and against which we felt no call, either from religion or policy, to enter a protest. We felt it to be due to Christian charity to make an effort, however unsuccessfully, to disabuse the minds of brethren, with whom we were anxious to maintain the unity of the spirit in bonds of peace, of prejudices and misapprehensions which we were confident had misled them. Events have taken place since the appointment of the committee, which invest the subject with additional importance. At that time the greatest danger immediately apprehended was a partial alienation, perhaps an external schism, among those who were as one in a common faith. But now, more potentious calamities are dreaded. The determined zeal with which a policy founded, for the most part, in the conviction that Slavery is a sin, is pressed upon the Federal Legislature, justifies the gloomiest forebodings in relation to the integrity of the Union and the stability of our free institutions. The question has passed from the Church to the State; it is no longer a debate among Christian ministers and Christian men, as to the terms of communion and the rights of particular communities to the Christian name. It is now a question as to the equality of the States which compose this great commonwealth of nations, and the obligation of the charter which binds them in federal alliance. The immense importance which, in this aspect, is given to the subject, has induced the chairman of your committee to present, upon his own responsibility, the following thoughts. He has been unable to consult the brethren who were appointed with him. And as he is deeply convinced that the position of the Southern, and perhaps, he may say, of the whole Presbyterian Church, in relation to Slavery, is the only position which can save the country from disaster and the Church from schism, he is quickened by the double consideration of patriotism and religion to record opinions which, however hastily expressed, have been maturely weighed.

1. The relation of the Church to Slavery cannot be definitely settled without an adequate apprehension of the nature and office of the Church itself. What, then, is the Church? It is not, as we fear too many are disposed to regard it, a moral institute of universal good, whose business it is to wage war upon every form of human ill, whether social, civil, political or moral, and to patronize every expedient which a romantic benevolence may suggest as likely to contribute to human comfort, or to mitigate the inconveniences of life. We freely grant, and sincerely rejoice in the truth, that the healthful operations of the Church, in its own appropriate sphere, re-act upon all the interests of man, and contribute to the progress and prosperity of society; but we are far from admitting either that it is the purpose of God that, under the present dispensation of religion, all ill shall be banished from this sublunary state, and earth be converted into a paradise, or that the proper end of the Church is the direct promotion of universal good. It has no commission to construct society afresh, to adjust its elements in different proportions, to re-arrange the distribution of its classes, or to change the forms of its political constitutions. The noble schemes of philanthropy which have distinguished christian nations; their magnificent foundations for the poor, the maimed and the blind; the efforts of the wise and good to mitigate human misery, and to temper justice and mercy in the penal visitations of the law; the various associations that have been formed to check and abate particular forms of evil, have all been quickened into life by the spirit of christianity. But still it is not the distinctive province of the church to build asylums for the needy or insane; to organize societies for the improvement of the penal code, or for arresting the progress of intemperance, gambling or lust. The problems which the anomalies of our fallen state are continually forcing on philanthropy, the church has no right directly to solve. She must leave them to the Providence of God and to human wisdom, sanctified and guided by the spiritual influences which it is her glory to foster and cherish. The church is a very peculiar society—voluntary in the sense that all its members become so, not by constraint, but willingly; but not in the sense that its doctrines, discipline and order, are the creatures of human will, deriving their authority and obligation from the consent of its members.

On the contrary, it has a fixed and unalterable constitution; and that constitution is the word of God. It is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is enthroned in it as a sovereign. It can hear no voice but His; obey no command but His; pursue no ends but His. Its officers are His servants, bound to execute only His will. Its doctrines are His teachings, which He, as a prophet, has given from God; its discipline His law, which He as king has ordained. The power of the church, accordingly, is only ministerial and declarative. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is her rule of faith and practice. She can announce what it teaches; enjoin what it commands; prohibit what it condemns, and enforce her testimonies by spiritual sanctions. Beyond the Bible she can never go, and apart from the Bible she can never speak. To the law and to the testimony, and to them alone, she must always appeal; and when they are silent, it is her duty to put her hand upon her lips.

These principles, thus abstractly stated, are not likely to provoke opposition, but the conclusion which flows from them, and for the sake of which we have here stated them, has unfortunately been too much disregarded; and that is, that the church is not at liberty to speculate. She has a creed, but no opinions. When she speaks, it must be in the name of the Lord, and her only argument is, thus it is written.

In conformity with this principle, has the church any authority to declare Slavery to be sinful? Or, in other words, has the Bible, anywhere, either directly or indirectly condemned the relation of master and servant, as incompatible with the will of God?

We think there can be little doubt that if the Church had universally repressed the spirit of speculation and had been content to stand by the naked testimony of God, we should have been spared many of the most effective desertations against Slavery. Deduct the opposition to which has arisen from sympathy with imaginary sufferings, from ignorance of its nature and misapplication of the crochets of philosophers—deduct the opposition which is due to sentiment, romance or speculation, and how much will be found to have originated from the humble and devout study of the scriptures? Will any man say that he who applies to them with an honest and unprejudiced mind, and discusses their teachings upon the subject, simply as a question of language and interpretation, will rise from the pages with the sentiments or spirit of a modern Abolitionist? Certain it is that no direct condemnation of it can anywhere be found in the sacred volume. A social element in all states, from the dawn of history until the present period, if it be the crying and damning sin which its enemies represent it to be, it is truly amazing that the Bible, which professes to be a lamp to our feet and a light to our path, to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work, nowhere gives the slightest caution against this tremendous evil. The master is nowhere rebuked as a monster of cruelty and tyranny—the slave nowhere exhibited as the object of peculiar compassion and sympathy. The manner in which the relation itself is spoken of and its duties prescribed, the whole tone and air of the sacred writers convey the impression that they themselves had not the least suspicion that they were dealing with a subject full of abominations and outrages. We read their language cool, dispassioned, didactic We find masters exhorted in the same connections with husbands, parents, magistrates; slaves exhorted in the same connection with wives, children and subjects. The Prophet or Apostle gives no note of alarm—raises no signal of distress when he comes to the slave and his master, and the unwary reader is in serious danger of concluding that, according to the Bible, it is not much more harm to be a master than a father—a slave than a child. But this is not all. The scriptures not only fail to condemn; they as distinctly sanction Slavery as any other social condition of man. The Church was organized in the family of a slaveholder; it was divinely regulated among the chosen people of God, and the peculiar duties of the parties are inculcated under the Christian economy. These are facts which cannot be denied. Our argument then is this. If the Church is bound to abide by the authority of the Bible, and that alone, she discharges her whole office in regard to Slavery when she declares what the Bible teaches, and enforces its laws by her own peculiar sanctions.

Where the scriptures are silent, she must be silent too. What the scriptures have not made essential to a christian profession, she does not undertake to make so. What the scriptures have sanctioned, she does not condemn. To this course she is shut up by the nature of her constitution. If she had universally complied with the provisions of her charter, the angry discussions which have disgraced her courts and produced bitterness and alienation among her own children, in different countries, and in different sections of the same land, would all have been prevented. The Abolition excitement derives most of its fury, and all its power, from the conviction which christian people, without warrant from God, have industriously propagated, that Slavery, essentially considered, is a sin. They have armed the instincts of our moral nature against it. They have given the dignity of principle to the clamours of fanaticism; and the consequence is that many churches are distracted and the country reeling under a series of assaults in which treachery to man is justified as obedience to God. According to the rule of faith which gives to the church its being, the relation of master and slave stands on the same footing with the other relations of life. In itself considered, it is not inconsistent with the will of God—it is not sinful. This is as much a doctrine of Christianity as the obligation of obedience to law. The church, therefore, cannot undertake to disturb the relation. The Bible further teaches there are duties growing out of this relation—duties of the master and the duties of the slave. The church must enforce these duties upon her own members. Here her jurisdiction stops. As a church—as the visible kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—she must venture to interfere no further, unless it be to repress the agitation of those who assume to be wiser and purer than the word of God. Those who corrupt the scriptures, who profanely add to the duties of the Decalogue, are no more entitled to exemption from ecclesiastical discipline than any other disturbers of the peace or fomenters of faction and discord. It is not a question whether masters can be received into the communion of the saints, but it is a question whether those who exclude them should not themselves be rejected.

We are far from insinuating that Abolitionists, as such, are unfit to be members of the church. Slavery may evidently be contemplated in various aspects: as a social arrangement, involving a distinction of classes, like Oriental caste, or European gradation of ranks; as a civil relation, involving rights, obligations, corresponding to its own nature; as a political condition, bearing upon the prosperity, happiness, and growth of communities. In any or in all these aspects, it may be opposed upon considerations of policy and prudence, as the despotism of Asia, the aristocracy of Europe, or the free institutions of America are opposed, without the imputation of sin upon the nature of the relation itself. The members of the church, as citizens and as men, have the same right to judge of the expediency or inexpediency of introducing and perpetuating in their own soil this institution, as in any other element of their social economy. But they transcend their sphere, and bring reproach upon the Scriptures as a rule of faith, when they go beyond these political considerations, and condemn Slavery as essentially repugnant to the will of God. They then corrupt the Scriptures, and are exposed to the malediction of those who trifle with the Divine testimony. The Southern churches have never asked their brethren in Europe, or in the non-slaveholding sections of their own land, to introduce Slavery among them; they have never asked them to approve it as the wisest and best constitution of society. All that they have demanded is, that their brethren would leave it where God has left it, and deal with it where it is found, as God has dealt with it. We insist upon it, that they should not disturb the tranquility of the State, by attempting to re-adjust our social fabric according to their own crochets, when we ourselves, the only parties who have a right to meddle, are satisfied with our condition. We do not recognise them as political apostles, to whom God has transferred from us the right inherent in every other people to manage their affairs in their own way, so long as they keep within the limits of the Divine law. If we fail in our social and political organization; if by consequence we lag behind in the progress of nations, we do not forfeit our right to self-government, and become the wards and minors of wiser and stronger States. It is as preposterous in our Northern and European brethren to undertake to force their system upon us, or to break up our own, in obedience to their notions, as it would be for us to wage a war upon theirs, on the ground that ours is better. Slavery, as a political question, is one in regard to which communities and States may honestly differ. But as a moral question, the Bible has settled it; and all we contend for is, that being a matter of liberty, we should not break fellowship for difference upon other grounds. If any man, however, is not content to stand by the word of God—if any Church will not tolerate the liberty with which Christ has made us free, that man and that Church cannot be vindicated from the charge of fomenting schism. They become justly exposed to censure. He who would debar a slaveholder from the table of the Lord, upon the simple and naked ground that he is a slaveholder, deserves himself to be excluded, for usurping the prerogatives of Christ, and introducing terms of communion which cast reproach upon the conduct of Jesus and the Apostles. He violates the very character of the church—is a traitor to its fundamental law.

We have been struck with three circumstances in the conduct of what may be called the Christian argument against slavery. The first is, that the principles from which, for the most part, the conclusion has been drawn, were the abstrusest of all speculations upon the vexed question of human rights and not the obvious teachings of the Scriptures. The second is, that when the argument has been professedly taken from the Bible, it has consisted in strained application of the law, that Scripture is its own interpreter; and the third is, that duties which the Bible enjoins were not only inadequately recognised, but forced into a system of morals whose fundamental principles exclude them.

The argument from philosophy, if the dogmas of sophists upon the nature and extent of human rights can be dignified with the title of philosophy, a Church court cannot admit to be authoritative, without doing violence to her own constitution. It is not denied that truth is truth, whether found in the Bible or out of it, and it is not denied that there is much truth, and truth of an important kind, which it is not in the province of revelation to teach. But then it should be remembered, that this is truth with which the Church, as such, has nothing to do. Neither should it be forgotten, that if human speculation directs to a moral result directly contradictory of the Scriptures, faith convicts it of falsehood, the word of God being a surer guide than the wit of man. When the question is, whether man is mistaken, or the word of God deceitful, the answer to the church cannot be doubtful. And yet how much of the declamation against Slavery, in which Christian people are prone to indulge, is founded upon principles utterly unsupported by the Scriptures! One man very complacently tells, that every man is entitled to the fruit of his own labour; and that the master, in appropriating that of the slave, defrauds him of his right. It is then denounced as a system of robbery and plunder, which every good man should labour to banish from the earth. But where is the maxim, in the sense in which it interpreted, to be found in the Scriptures? Where even in any respectable system of moral philosophy? Where are we taught that the labour which any man puts forth in his own person is always his, or belongs to him of right, and cannot belong to another? How does it appear that what is physically his is legally his? Another insists on the absolute equality of the species, and can find no arrangement in harmony with reason, but that which shall reduce the race to a stagnant uniformity of condition. But where do the Scriptures teach that an essential equality as men implies a corresponding equality of State? And who is authorized to limit the application of this sweeping principle to the sole relation of slavery? It is as much the weapon of the Socialist and leveller as of the Abolitionist, and the Church cannot accept it without renouncing the supremacy of the Scriptures; neither can she proceed upon it to excommunicate the slaveholder, without fulminating her anathemas against the rich and noble. Another insists upon the essential and indestructible personability of men, and vituperates Slavery, as reducing human beings to the condition of chattels and of things, as if it were possible that human legislation could convert matter into mind, or mind into matter, or as if Slavery were not professedly a relation of man to man. The arguments from this and all similar grounds can be easily answered. It will be found in every case, even that the principle assumed is false in itself or distorted in its application, or that the whole discussion proceeds on a gratuitous hypothesis in regard to the nature of Slavery. But whether they can be answered or not, no deductions of man can set aside the authority of God. The Bible is supreme, and as long as it allows the institution, the Church should not dare to rebuke it. In a court of Jesus Christ we would not think of presenting any consideration as conclusive, but thus saith the Lord.

But when the argument is professedly conducted from the Bible, it is in violation of the great principle, that Scripture is its own interpreter. It is notorious—it is, indeed, universally conceded, that no express condemnations of Slavery have ever been produced from the sacred volume. The plan is, in the absence of anything precise or definite, to demonstrate an incongruity betwixt the analogy and the general spirit of the Bible, and the facts of Slavery. Some general principle is seized on, such as the maxim of universal benevolence, or of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, and brought into contrast with the degradation of the abuses of bondage. Or specific precepts, such as this in relation to the family, are singled out, with which it is supposed Slavery renders it impossible to comply. The fallacy in these cases is easily detected. The same line of argument, carried out in precisely the same way, would make havoc with all the institutions of civilized society. Indeed, it would be harder to defend from the Scriptures the righteousness of great possessions than the righteousness of Slavery. The same principle which would make the master emancipate his slave on the ground of benevolence, would make the rich man share his estates with his poor neighours; and he who would condemn the institution as essentially and inherently evil, because it sometimes incidentally involves the disruption of family ties, would condemn the whole texture of society in the non-slaveholding States, where the separation of parents and children, husbands and wives, is often a matter of stern necessity. But, however the argument might be answered, it is enough for a Christian man, who compares Scripture with Scripture, to know that Slavery is expressly excepted from the application of this or any other principle in the sweeping sense of any of the Abolitionists. It is not a case left to the determination of general principles: it is provided for in the law. If the Scriptures were silent in regard to it, we might appeal to analogies, to aid us in reaching the will of God; but as they have mentioned the subject again and again, and stated the principles which are to be added to it, we are shut up to these special testimonies.

Those who have been conversant with works against Slavery, cannot have failed to be struck with the awkward and incongruous appearance which in these works the commands of the Scriptures to masters and servants assume. They lay down principles which make Slavery an utter abomination—treason to man and rebellion against God. They represent it as an enormous system of cruelty, tyranny, and impiety. They make it a fundamental duty to labour for its extirpation, and yet will not venture directly and boldly, at least Christian Abolitionists, to counsel insurrection or murder; they will even repeat the commands of the Bible, as if in mockery of all their speculations. Now we ask, if these commands are not forced appendages to their moral system? Are they not awkwardly inserted? The moral system of Abolitionists does not legitimately admit them; and if they were not restrained by respect for the Bible from carrying out their own doctrines, they would find themselves forced to recommend measures to the slave very different from obedience to his master. Those, accordingly, who prefer consistency to piety, have not scrupled to reject these precepts, and to renounce the book which enjoins them. They feel the incongruity betwixt their doctrines and these duties, and they do not hesitate to revile the Scriptures as the patron of tyranny and bondage. Admit the principle that Slavery, essentially considered, is not a sin, and the injunctions of Scripture are plain, consistent, intelligible; deny the principle, and the Bible seems to be made up of riddles.

Such is a general view of the Christian argument against Slavery. We are not conscious of having done it any injustice. We have endeavoured to study it impartially and candidly; but we confess that the conviction grows upon us that those who most violently denounce this relation, have formed their opinions in the first instance independently of the Bible, and then by special pleading have endeavoured to pervert its teachings to the patronage of their assumptions. They strike us much more as apologists for the defects and omissions of the scriptures, than as humble inquiries, sitting at the feet of Jesus to learn His will. They have settled it in their own minds that Slavery is a sin; then the Bible must condemn it, and they set to work to make out the case that the Bible has covertly and indirectly done what they feel it ought to have done. Hence those peculiar features of the argument to which we have already adverted.

To this may be added a total misapprehension of the nature of the institution. Adjuncts and concomitants of Slavery are confounded with its essence, and abuses are seized upon as characteristic of the very genius of the institution.

If this method of arrangement is to be persisted in, the consequences must ultimately be injurious to the authority of the sacred writers. Those who have not a point to gain, will easily detect the sophistry which makes the scriptures subsidiary to Abolitionism, and if they are to receive it as a fundamental principle of morals that there can be no right to the labour of another, independently of contrast, and this is the essence of Slavery, they will be shut up to the necessity of denying the sufficiency and plenary inspiration of the scriptures. Like Morell, they will take their stand upon the defective morality of the Bible, and scout the idea of any external, authoritative rule of faith. The very same spirit of rationalism which has made the Prophets and Apostles succumb to philosophy and impulse in relation to the doctrines of salvation, lies at the foundation of modern speculation in the rights of man. Opposition to Slavery has never been the offspring of the Bible. It has sprung from visionary theories of human nature and society—it has sprung from the misguided reason of man—it comes as natural, not as revealed truth; and when it is seen that the word of God stands in the way of it, the lively oracles will be stripped of their authority, and reduced to the level of mere human utterances.

We affectionately warn our brethren of the mischiefs that must follow from their mode of conducting the argument against us—they are not only striking at Slavery, but they are striking at the foundation of our common faith. They are helping the cause of rationalism. We need not repeat that a sound philosophy must ever coincide with revelation, but what we insist upon is that in cases of conflict, the scriptures must be supreme. Man may err, but God can never lie. If men are at liberty from their own heads to frame systems of morality, which render null and void the commandments of God, we see not why they are not equally at liberty to frame systems of doctrines which render vain the covenant of grace. If they are absolutely their own law, why not absolutely their own teachers? It is, therefore, a very grave question which they have to decide, who, in opposition to the example of the apostle of our Lord, exclude masters from the communion of the saints, and from the hopes of the Gospel.

The history of the world is full of illustrations that the foolishness of God is wiser than man. There is a nobler moderation in the scriptures, on which alone depends the stability of States and the prosperity and success of the whole social economy. It rebukes alike the indifference and torpor which would repress the spirit of improvement and stiffen society into a fixed and lifeless condition, and the spirit of impatience and innovation which despises the lessons of experience rushes into visionary schemes of reformation. It is in the healthful operation of all the limbs and members of the body politic that true progress consists; and he who fancies that deformities can be cured by violent and hasty amputations, may find that in removing what seemed to be only excrescences, he is inflicting a fatal stroke upon vital organs of the system. Slavery, to those who are unaccustomed to its operations, may seem to be an unnatural and monstrous condition; but it will be found that no principles can be pleaded to justify its removal which may not be applied with fatal success to the dearest interests of man. They who join in the unhallowed crusade against the institutions of the South, will have reason to repent that they have set an engine in motion which cannot be arrested until it has crushed and ground to powder the safeguards of life and property among themselves.

Deeply convinced as we are that the proper position of the church in relation to Slavery is that which we have endeavoured to present in these pages, we would earnestly and solemnly expostulate with those denominations at the North who have united in the outcry against us, and urge them to reconsider their steps in the fear of God and under the guidance of His word. We ask them to take the Apostles as their guide. We are solemn and earnest, not only because we deplore a schism in the body of Christ, but because we deplore a schism among the confederated States of the Union. We know what we say when we declare our deliberate conviction that the continued agitation of Slavery must sooner or later shiver this government into atoms; and agitated it must continue to be, unless the churches of Jesus Christ take their stand firmly and immoveably upon the platform of the Bible. The people of the South ask nothing more—they will be content with nothing less. Let the churches take this position, and the people of the North will find their moral instincts rallying to the support of our federal constitution, and will give to the winds a policy founded on the profane insinuation that Slavery is essentially a sin. Free Soilism is nothing but the application to politics of this unscriptural dogma. If Slavery be indeed consistent with the Bible, their responsibility is tremendous, who, in obedience to blind impulses and visionary theories, pull down the fairest fabric of government the world has ever seen, rend the body of Christ asunder, and dethrone the Saviour in his own kingdom. What a position for churches of Jesus Christ; aiding and abetting on the one hand the restless and turbulent designs of agitators, demagogues and radical reformers, and giving countenance on the other to a principle which, if legitimately carried out, robs the scriptures of their supremacy, and delivers us over to the folly and madness of rationalism.

Are our country, our Bible, our interests on earth and our hopes for heaven, to be sacrificed on the altars of a fierce fanaticism? Are laws to be made which God never enacted—doctrines to be taught which the Apostles have condemned, and are they to be propagated and forced on men at the peril of every thing that is dear and precious? We conjure our brethren—for such we shall still call them—we conjure our brethren to pause. We do not ask them to patronize Slavery—we do not wish them to change their own institutions—we only ask them to treat us as the Apostles treated the slaveholders of their day, and leave to us the liberty which we accord to them, of conducting our affairs according to our own convictions of truth and duty. We ask it of them as christians—as professed followers of Christ; and if this reasonable demand is refused, upon them and not upon us must rest the perilous responsibility of the disasters that must inevitably follow. We are not alarmists, but Slavery is implicated in every fibre of Southern society; it is with us a vital question, and it is because we know that interference with it cannot and will not be much longer endured, we raise our warning voice. We would save the country if we could. We would save the Constitution which our fathers framed, and we would have our children and our children's children, for countless generations, worship in the temple which our fathers reared. But this cannot be, unless our whole people shall be brought to feel that Slavery is no ground for discord, and that in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free. Would to God that this blessed consummation could be reached!

In the meantime christian masters at the South should address themselves with earnestness and vigour to the discharge of their solemn duties to their slaves. We would stir up their minds, not that they have been inattentive to the subject, but that they may take the more diligent heed. The most important and commanding of all their obligations is that which relates to religious institutions. Food and raiment, and shelter, their interests will prompt them to provide; but as the labour of the slave is expended for their benefit, they are bound, by the double consideration of justice and of mercy, to care for his soul. We rejoice that so much has already been done in imparting the gospel to this class; and we hope that the time is not far distant when every christian master will feel that he is somewhat in the same sense responsible for the religious education of his slaves as for the religious education of his children. The church, too, as an organized society, should give special attention to the subject. There are many questions connected with it, which ought to be gravely and deliberately considered. We have no doubt that much effort has been uselessly expended, because injudiciously applied. One thing we are satisfied—their religious teachers should never be taken from among themselves. There is two great a proneness to superstition and extravagance among the most enlightened of them to entrust them with the care of souls. Their circumstances preclude them from the preparation and study which such a change involves. There was wisdom in the statute of the primitive Church which allowed none but a freeman to be a minister of the gospel. To say nothing of the fact that their time is under the direction of their masters, we would as soon think of making ministers and elders and organizing churches of children, as of according the same privileges to slaves. They would soon degrade piety into fanaticism, and the church into bedlam. We rejoice that the Presbyterians of our own Synod have uniformly acted in conformity with this principle; and although our success may, by consequences, be slow, it will eventually be sure.—*From the Charleston Mercury.*

LETTER FROM SENATOR BUTLER, ON THE PRESIDENTIAL QUESTION.

WASHINGTON, August 7, 1852.

MY DEAR SIR: It may, perhaps, be my duty, in reply to your letter, to express some of my opinions upon the more prominent political questions which now engross the public mind, especially as they may affect the State of South Carolina.

With a firm belief that the Constitution of the United States has been undermined by construction, and the interests of the South sacrificed by compromises, I could entertain no opinion that could favour one or the other. When the Missouri compromise was adopted, I believe a fatal breach was made in the Constitution, and that the elements of the dominant majority were then introduced into this Government which now assume to rule the destinies of this country. This measure had the sanction of great names and pure patriots. I, nevertheless, think it a fatal error, influenced, perhaps, by lights which time and events have shed upon its operation, and which were not apparent to those who adopted it. It was regarded, however, as a part of the system of this Government for a long time; and if it had been observed in good faith, perhaps the South ought not to have disturbed it. But its spirit and principles have been notoriously disregarded and violated. With this certainty before me, I would have been false to my own convictions, if I had been willing to adopt any compromise involving any concession by the South. And I am not now willing, by any opinion which I may express, or any course of policy which I may pursue, to give any sanction to the Compromise measures of the last Congress. Time has not made them more acceptable to me than they were at the beginning.

They met with my opposition while they were under discussion, and my protest after they were passed, and my judgment can never be reconciled to approve them. They afford no security to the South against the agitation of the Slavery question. That agitation is doing its work every day—in the schoolhouse, pulpit, halls of Congress, and in the assemblies of the people and State Legislatures of the non-slaveholding States, not only unchecked and uncontrolled by compromises and platforms, but, in every successive state of its aggression, is ratified and sanctioned by them.

With regard to the admission of California, my views upon that subject have been frequently expressed, and remain unchanged. That State having been admitted without precedent, *it has opened to the majority the power of making and moulding States*, rather than admitting new States into the Union, according to the Constitution. Justice and candour, however, require me to say, that California has no temptations from interest that I can see, to be against the South on the doctrines of free trade, and at present, perhaps, none on the subject of African Slavery.

With these views, it is impossible that I can take any interest in the Presidential election, so far as to give any positive countenance to the doctrines and measures of the Compromise; and I cannot overlook or disregard the fact, that both the candidates for the Presidency stand upon the Compromise as part of their platform—each of the great parties having solemnly incorporated it into its political creed. I cannot abandon the principles upon which I base my opposition to these measures or approve now what I disapproved and denounced a few months ago. Notwithstanding my personal regard for Gen. Scott, and my admiration for his high military fame, I am the very antipode of his school of politics, and would be compelled, if he were elected, to take an active part against his administration, if it should be conducted upon the doctrines which he maintains, and guided by the associates with whom he is allied. With Gen. Pierce, I might have, politically, nearer affinities. In doctrine, he is a strict constructionist, of the State Rights' school, and so far as it regards the South, I believe he has no prejudice or bigotry, and would do his duty to her, according to the Constitution. But both my experience and observation teach me, that *it is in vain to look here for the reform of this Government, or to hope for the security of the South as the result of a Presidential election.* The disease which we would heal is radical; and, unless there be applied some enforcible power to confine the Federal Government within the sphere prescribed by the Constitution, it must become an elective despotism. In my deliberate judgment, this enforcible power will never be found in any Chief Magistrate that will ever be elected. *The power to regulate commerce alone*, which may be so used as to exhaust the means of one section to build up the prosperity of another, unless controlled, will, like Aaron's rod, swallow up all the rest.

These being my convictions, I do not desire to see South Carolina absorbed in any organization looking to a Presidential contest. If she cannot be the champion of the whole South, let her assume the humbler and more unpretending office of being the sentinel of her own honour and interests, and the firm and consistent friend of her natural allies. It may become her duty to vote in the approaching Presidential election, and if so, that duty, though disagreeable it may be, should be performed; but in doing so, I should be sorry to see our State descend to wage an internecine war at home. When the time to vote shall arrive, let her take choice of the alternatives presented, and vote for the candidate least offensive to her self-respect and political principles. Impressed as I am at present, I think the State should vote the Democratic ticket, in preference to the Whig. It is her duty to maintain that this is a confederacy of sovereign States, instead of a consolidated empire, subject only to the will and wisdom of a bare majority. I would not have South Carolina to forget that she is one of those sovereign States, and to suppose herself bound to conform in all things to the policy of parties in her sister Southern States; yet I think it is her true policy on questions of great and vital interest, which involve the public safety, not to wholly isolate herself from the States with whom she is most nearly identified. In the practice and observance of this policy, she may find a motive and justification for casting her vote in the approaching election for President. In deciding upon her course, she should be governed, not by those partizan feelings which too often constitute the elements which enter into a contest like that now before the country, but by those high considerations of patriotic duty and devotion to principle, to which she is indebted for her present rank, position, and consideration among the States of the Union.

I am, dear sir, with very great respect, your obedient servant, A. P. BUTLER.

Col. I. W. HAYNE, Charleston, S. C.

Selections.

EMIGRATION OF PEOPLE OF COLOUR.

WE (*Evening Post*) give below a report of the testimony of John Wesley Harrison, a coloured emigrant to Jamaica, from the State of South Carolina, upon the subject of emigration of free people of colour to that Island. The following extract from a private letter, received by us a few days since, from a gentleman who resides in that Island, lends some importance to the testimony:

"The movement in favour of immigration of "coloured Americans has gathered fresh strength "since the publication of the evidence of Mr. Har"rison. The Chief Justice and Governor have come "out very decidedly, and we are now raising a sub"scription to send him (Harrison) over next month, "to enter into communication with coloured emi"grants. He is delighted with the country; and "on his explanations our people see that they would "be much better off with your Americans, at their "own rate of wages, than with our own people, at "the rates they have been getting, which indeed, "Mr. Harrison says, is ample pay for the trifling "extent of work they perform."

EXAMINATION OF MR. JOHN WESLEY HARRISON, FROM SOUTH CAROLINA,

At a Meeting within Lady Mico's Institution, Hanover street, Kingston, on the evening of Wednesday, the 23d of June, 1852.

PRESENT—MR. HARRISON; MESSRS. WM. WRIGHT, JAMES DAVIDSON, AND W. WEMYSS ANDERSON,

Ques.—From what part of the United States have you come; what was your occupation there; and how long have you resided on this island?

Ans.—I came from South Carolina. I had a rice and cotton plantation there. I have been upwards of a year on this island.

Q.—What induced you to change your home?

A.—I did so simply on account of the oppression under which I, in common with other free persons of colour, laboured in that country. I wished, for myself and family, a country where my family could have a fair chance of advancement in life, which I knew they never could have in America. My family consisted of a wife, six sons, and one daughter. I brought them all with me to this island.

Q.—What has been your occupation in this island?

A.—Shortly after my arrival I purchased the property called Orange Park, in the Parish of St. David. It is a coffee property, and cattle pen. I now reside there with my family.

Q.—Has this country and the state of society in it disappointed you, or otherwise?

A.—The country has realized my expectation, in respect of the soil, the climate, the nature and value, and variety of its productions, and the state of society in reference to persons of colour. The one only disappointment I have had has been the labouring population. They are indolent, and inefficient beyond anything I have ever seen. I have lost a great deal of money in attempting to carry on cultivation with them. Their mode of working appears to me unskilful, and their implements are bad.

Q.—Will you explain this more particularly?

A.—Their hoes appear too narrow and heavy for the work of clearing and weeding. They seem to think a certain amount of work sufficient for a day, and they will not go beyond it.

Q.—What amount of labour will an American free coloured labourer, such as you have been accustomed to hire on your own plantation in America, or to see on other properties in that country, perform in comparison with labourers of the same class in this island.

A.—I admit that the ground may be somewhat harder to work in this island than in South Carolina. A man there will readily, and he commonly does, clean an acre a day, the vegetation being as rank there in summer as it is here. But I could guaranty that such labourers as I have been accustomed to employ in America would perform four times the work per day of the labourers in this island.

Q.—Did you ever see sugar cultivation in America, and would your remarks apply to such labourers cleaning canes?

A.—I have seen sugar cultivation in South Carolina; almost every planter there cultivates a portion of sugar. My remarks apply to such cleaning as is required on cane fields. An acre and a half of cleaning of canes per day is a common task for free labourers there, as well as slaves, to perform. I have always found free labourers less troublesome than slaves.

Q.—Are you of opinion that any considerable number of free coloured labourers of that class might be induced to come to this island, and engage themselves as labourers on the plantations; and, if so, on what terms, at what rates of wages, and on what service could such be engaged?

A.—From what I know, and from my late letters from America, I am convinced that almost the whole coloured population is in search of a new country. I have no doubt that a very little management would induce multitudes, who are now agricultural labourers, to come to this island, and engage themselves in the like occupation on our plantations. The usual term of an agricultural labourer's wages there, is from eighty-five dollars to one hundred and twenty dollars a year. If he get the latter sum, he is only found in a house, and not in maintenance. If he get only from eighty dollars to eighty-five dollars a year, he gets half a bushel of meal and 3 lbs. of bacon a week in addition, the value of which is about half a dollar. But, for this rate of wages and allowance, they engage by the year, and work six days in the week, and from sunrise to sunset. I think it would be quite sufficient to induce them to move, if they knew that such engagements could be got in this island. They are at present afraid to move, on account of the small, imperfect, and contradictory accounts they have of this country, and their dread of destitution in going to a strange place, where they have no friends or people whom they know. My remarks apply chiefly to the agricultural population of North and South Carolina, and Georgia. The climate in these States, in the summer season (which is the working season), is similar to that of this island, and so are the productions. But more can be done here, as there is no winter. I have had, however, within the last nine months, letters from many persons in the States of New York and Pennsylvania, expressing their interest in this country, and their desire to come to it. But they have been exceedingly perplexed by contradictory accounts, some from people in this island, dissuading them from coming. I am decidedly of opinion that it would be much for their benefit to come here, and beneficial to the island. Many would come at their own expense, and many could not do so, but would engage to work out the expense of their passage. But it would be imprudent to let them have their passages paid.

Q.—How could they best be addressed, whether by newspapers, or agency, and what sort of agency?

A.—Newspapers they seldom see. I think agents ought to be sent with the invitation to them to come. Agents of their own colour would be most readily listened to.

Q.—Do you think any considerable number would come over as agricultural settlers?

A.—Very great numbers of that class would come. Many of them with capital. Some with no inconsiderable amount of capital, which they would invest readily in the purchase of land. I am looking now daily for the arrival of some of that class.

(Signed) JOHN WESLEY HARRISON.

The above testimony given in presence of
J. DAVIDSON.
WILLM. M. WRIGHT.
WM. WEMYSS ANDERSON.

[THE *Standard* of July 29th contained the able Letter of Senator Chase to Benjamin F. Butler. Below is Mr. Butler's reply.]

B. F. Butler to Senator Chase,

In reply to his Letter, dated July 18th, 1852, urging the propriety of nominating a third Candidate for the Presidency.

NEW YORK, July 31st, 1852.

DEAR SIR: I have read, with care, the public letter addressed to me by you, in the columns of the New York *Herald* of the 20th instant. It reached me while engaged in preparing for an important case, the argument of which was commenced on the 21st, and only concluded yesterday.

I learn from this communication that you find it impossible, without doing violence to your convictions of right and duty, to support the candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, nominated by the Democratic Convention lately held at Baltimore. You think the Slavery resolutions, incorporated in the platform of that Convention, irreconcilable with the resolutions adopted, and the declarations made, in August, 1848, by the Buffalo Convention, of which you were a member; and you think, also, that Gen. Pierce and Mr. King, the present Democratic candidates, are so distinctly committed to the support of the platform put forth by the Convention which nominated them, and so thoroughly identified with the interests of the Slave Power, that they cannot, "without marked inconsistency," be supported by those who united in the Free Soil movement of 1848, and especially by such of this class as, like yourself, took a leading part in the Buffalo Convention. You have, therefore, resolved to vote against these candidates, and, by "independent action," personally and in concert with others to do what you can to defeat their election.

You do not distinctly speak of the call lately published, under the signature of Hon. Samuel Lewis, inviting "the Free Soil Democracy" to send delegates to a Convention to be held at Pittsburg on the 11th of August, for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States; but from the time chosen by you for the publication of your letter, as well as from its contents, I cannot but infer that it is designed to favour this movement; that you propose to attend, or, in some way, to be represented in the coming Pittsburgh Convention; and that to this assemblage you look for the organization, and for the candidates, of the "Independent Democracy" with which you propose to act.

Before the publication of your letter, the Free Soil Democrats of New York—whose organization was long since merged in that of the re-united State Democracy, and who were thus represented in the late Baltimore Convention—had, by uniting with other Democrats, in ratification meetings, and in various other ways, generally accepted the nomination of that Convention, and expressed their determination to give the nominees their cordial support. The like determination had also been expressed by that portion of the Democratic press of the State which, in 1848, supported the principles and candidates of

the Free Democracy. This course does not, it appears, coincide with your views of policy or duty, and you have stated at large the grounds of your dissent.

Without now stopping to notice them in detail, it is sufficient in this place to say, that the Free Soil Democrats of New York, having been represented in the Baltimore Convention, and having, by the votes and the voices of their delegates, united in the nominations of Pierce and King, it was not to be expected that they should repudiate these nominations, however they might dislike, or object to, any part of the platform; and that the support of the nominees, in the judgment of those thus represented, was not merely demanded as a political duty, but was, moreover, further commended to their minds and judgments, by the impression prevalent among New York Democrats of both the late sections, that the causes which led to the disputes and divisions of 1848 had ceased to exist, and by a desire, equally general, to redeem this State and the Union from Whig rule—a result only to be accomplished, as they suppose, by their united exertions in behalf of the same tickets, State and National.

It is not unknown to you, that individuals and journals of this State, connected in 1848 with the Free Democracy, have in several instances accompanied their acceptance and support of the present Democratic candidates with protests, more or less decided, against that part of the platform which relates to Slavery. You refer to this fact, and while you express your own inability to see the propriety or the prudence of this course, and the "keen regrets" with which you have witnessed it, you yet declare, for yourself and for others sharing with you these regrets, that you will not "question the motives, or the fidelity to their own convictions" of those who have taken it.

In this, you have but obeyed your own sense of justice, and exhibited your usual modesty and candour. Free Soil Democrats, distinguished for their intelligence and honour, of other States, as well as of New York, while dissenting from, and protesting against the platform of the Baltimore Convention, had avowed their intention of supporting its nominees: and while you claimed, for yourself, the right to decide, according to your own convictions, in what direction, and how far, you should go, in manifesting your own disapprobation of the Slavery resolutions proclaimed at Baltimore, you could not, as a just man, deny to others, differently circumstanced, the right of deciding for themselves, the same question; nor as a man conscious of his own fallibility, venture to affirm, that these decisions were not as honest, and possibly as wise, as your own.

The matter being one of public concernment, and of grave importance, it is not surprising that you should desire to place before the public your reasons for rejecting, not merely the exceptionable part of the Baltimore platform, but the nominees of the convention, and for the hostile movement in which you are about to engage. To set forth these reasons; to remonstrate with Free Soil Democrats (and especially with those belonging to this state), who have decided to support Pierce and King; and to induce, if you can, Democrats who acted with you in 1848 to act with you now—these I take to be the main objects of your letter. You have addressed it to me, not because I had publicly taken ground in favour of the Baltimore nominees—for this, hitherto, I have not done—but, as stated by yourself, "because we were co-labourers in the preparation of the platform promulgated by the Buffalo Convention, and afterwards closely connected in our relations to the convention and its nominees; and because, also, we both profess the same democratic faith, and desire the success of the same democratic measures." However much I may regret the necessity under which your letter has laid me, of coming before the public with a lengthened reply, I cheerfully admit, that in the circumstances you have mentioned, you had good warrant, if you thought proper to use it, for giving your address to the public the form of an address to me.

So far as your letter is designed to explain and to vindicate your rejection of the Slavery resolutions of the Baltimore Convention, it expresses, substantially, my own convictions, and receives my entire concurrence.

The main purpose for which that Convention had been assembled, was to nominate candidates for the re-united national democracy—for a party which, though numbering in its ranks a large majority of the electors of the United States, had, in consequence of dissensions and divisions, originating in the necessity of legislating for the territory of Oregon and for territories expected to be acquired, and in the end, actually acquired, from Mexico, and turning on the question of Slavery in those territories, lost its ascendancy in the Union, as well as in several of the States.

In the mean time, the question of Slavery in the territories had been practically settled by a series of legislative acts, some of them, in their nature, irrepealable, and others of them obnoxious alike—though for reasons diametrically opposite—to Free Soil Democrats in the North and to many Democrats in the South. In this state of things, what was the dictate of prudence, as well as of comity and justice? Obviously, that while the convention reaffirmed the leading and distinguishing principles of the national democracy, in which all its members agreed; and while it declared the known views of its constituents, upon questions of political policy, in respect to which the democracy, as a party, differed from their opponents, it should either carefully abstain from topics connected with the divisions of 1848, or, if allusion was made to them at all, that it should be in terms so broad and tolerant as to enable Democrats of the South and of the North, the East and the West, whatever might be their particular opinions on the topics referred to—however diverse—however extreme—to sustain them with freedom, with a just self-respect, and with a fraternal regard to the equal rights of others.

Wise and disinterested Democrats, in every quarter of the Union, thus desired and expected the Convention to act. It was only in this way that the wounds of 1848 could be effectually healed; it was only in this way that the lessons taught by the conflicts and reverses of that year could be turned to good account. For the first and most important of them was, that Democrats, in every section of the country, should be permitted, with entire freedom, to hold, and, in all constitutional ways, to express, their particular opinions on any question of public policy within the power of the federal government, without being placed under the ban of political excommunication. So much, at least, was tacitly implied in that reunion of the party which secured its unbroken representation at Baltimore.

Instead of pursuing this course, the Convention—under what circumstances I cannot stop to inquire—passed the three Slavery resolutions recited in your letter. I agree with you in thinking them irreconcilable with the Buffalo platform. I was associated with you in the preparation of that document, as chairman of the committee. I reported it to the Convention; and to it, in what I believe to be its true sense and spirit, yet I hold, entirely and without reserve. I, therefore, concur with you, in your rejection, on this ground, of the resolutions in question.

Nor shall I question either your right to take, or the propriety of your taking, in respect to Messrs. Pierce and King, the extreme step on which you have decided. You were, it is true, with other Ohio Democrats, represented in the Baltimore Convention; and your delegates concurred in making the nominations. Such relations, under ordinary circumstances, impose on the constituent the duty of support, or at least, of refraining from active opposition. This is the common law of party associations.

The reasons assigned in your letter for rejecting nominations, and for actively opposing the nominees, are, I doubt not, conscientiously entertained; and being satisfactory to your own mind, should, of course, be obeyed by you. Their influence, beyond yourself, must, however, entirely depend on the force with which they strike the minds of others.

Before your letter reached me, most of the points so elaborately discussed by you had occurred to me, and, in the course of my reflections, had been considered and disposed of.

But I have other and higher reasons for rejecting these resolutions, than their repugnance to the Buffalo platform.

Not to dwell on the bad logic or worse morality of affirming, as does the second of the series, that the preceding resolution, originally adopted in 1840 "covers and was intended to embrace" not only such Slavery agitation as existed in 1840, but also the whole subject as it now exists, in such manner as to apply it to questions which have only arisen since the date of the war with Mexico—these three resolutions as they now stand, must be understood to cover and as intended to embrace every kind of discussion—whether in or out of Congress—however constitutional in its form and object, and however moderate in its terms, upon any topic connected with Slavery. And this interdict is not only to apply to any such discussion in respect to Slavery in the slave States, where the Federal Government has no power to touch it, but also in respect to Slavery in the District of Columbia, or other places under the exclusive control of that Government.

This attempt to stifle free public discussion, seems to me a most daring and dangerous violation of the spirit of the Constitution, and of the first principles of civil liberty.

By the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, Congress can "make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press;" yet have we, in the case before us, a political convention doing, or attempting to do, this very thing; and this assault on freedom of thought and utterance is rendered doubly dangerous by the fact, that it has been substantially seconded and followed up by the Whig Convention.

The two Conventions representing constituencies wide apart as the poles, on most questions of principle and policy, deserting, each, the first great duty of a political party—that of watching each other to the end that the republic receive no detriment—set themselves to the task of subverting a right, secured, indeed, by the Constitution, but not acquired through it, nor from any other human charter—one of those original and natural rights, for the preservation of which government is instituted, and which is itself declared by Jefferson and Madison, in the very documents referred to by the Democratic Convention, as one of the sources of its political creed, "the only effectual guardian of every other right!"*

The topic eminently deserves a full and fearless discussion; but I cannot, in this place, perform this service for "free speech," without exhausting space required for other matters.

The Slavery resolutions of the Baltimore platform I rejected promptly and without reserve; and as I was resolved, on the one hand, not to conceal, on any occasion when candour should call for them, my opinions on this point, and unwilling, on the other, to obtrude them where the frank and full expression of them might be deemed by any a trespass on the proprieties of the occasion, I determined to abstain from attending any of the public meetings called to ratify the nominations, or to promote the election, of the Democratic candidates. It, however, seemed to me, on the most deliberate and comprehensive survey I was able to make of the condition and relations, present and prospective, of the whole country, that I should best promote all its great interests—and among these I include what yet remains unaccomplished of the measures enumerated in the Buffalo platform—by casting my vote for these candidates; and this—with only the reservation necessary to guard against possible, but most improbable, contingencies, which, should they occur, might demand a change of views—I accordingly resolved to do.

The following are among the reasons which led to this conclusion:

The Executive branch of the federal government will have been, on the 4th March next, for four years in the hands of the Whig party. During the first part of the term, this party had the control of the House of Representatives. From this fact, and from the influence which a Whig Executive will always exert on the action of Congress, even though there may be a nominally Democratic majority in each House, the legislation of the country, especially in respect to financial matters, has been gradually becoming more and more unsound. No one knows this better than yourself. The evil tendency of this state of things has been hitherto kept in check by various causes—among others, by the mere want of time for the ordinary business of legislation.

The next Congress will be under less restraint in this respect than the last two; and, with the tide of prosperity now flowing in upon the country, it needs no prophet to foretell what will be the character of its legislation, if the Executive department shall be in the hands of the Whig party. It seemed to me all-important to prevent such a catastrophe. From the known character and principles, personal and political, of the Democratic nominees, I think they are well qualified to bring back the administration to that limited construction of federal powers—that equal and exact justice to all sections of the country, and to all classes—that caution in imposing public burthens—that frugality in public expenditures—and that simplicity and moderation in the general working of the government—which constitute, in respect to these most important topics, the essence of the Jeffersonian Democracy, which you and I both desire to see predominant.

It seemed, also, to me, that while all the other interests of the country imperatively demanded the restoration of the Democratic ascendency in the federal government, the interests of human freedom would at least be as safe, for the next four years, in the hands of the Democratic party—a party whose original principles are identified with freedom and progress—as in the hands of the modern Whig party, of which you truly declare that it is "marked "by devotion to the interests of property rather "than to the rights of man."

The condition and interests of the State of New York had also much to do with my decision. As one of the consequences of the dissensions by which the New York Democracy was divided, the State fell into the hands of the Whigs, who soon entered upon a course of financial policy very dangerous to the credit and prosperity of the State, and, as lately adjudged by our highest tribunal, directly in the teeth of the constitution. But though the constitution has been saved by the firmness and fidelity of the judiciary, yet within the acknowledged limits of constitutional power there is ample room for a large amount of reckless legislation; and matters have been kept by our present Whig rulers in such a state as to enable them, should they succeed at the coming election, to enter anew upon the career they had commenced.

Considering the vast magnitude of the interests involved in the coming election, I was unwilling to contribute in any degree, however slight, to the success of the Whig party in this State. Opposition by Free Soil Democrats of New York to Pierce and King would give aid and comfort in this State to that party, and such "aid and comfort" I could not, consistently with my sense of duty, as the matter then appeared to me, by any means extend.

Since the receipt of your letter, I have reconsidered the subject, in the light of the facts and reasonings contained in it, but without finding any sufficient reason for abandoning these views, or changing the resolve to which they led.

You think there is a marked inconsistency in professing to hold to the Buffalo platform, and yet supporting Pierce and King; and you have stated, at length, the grounds of your opinion.

From its very nature the case is one of judgment—of conscience. It is a question, not of fact, or science, but of prudence and morality, which refers itself to the private judgment of two individuals—and to which each of them desires to give a frank and honest answer.

Each is bound fairly to consider the argument of the other; but as the decision of each must be upon his own responsibility, each, as an honest man, is bound to abide by his own matured convictions.

I have already stated by what considerations and motives I was led to give a different answer to the question before us. I have also stated that I have found in your letter, after careful consideration, no sufficient cause for reversing my decision. I cannot give up my convictions, merely because they differ from yours; you would despise me were I capable of such an act.

With entire propriety might I here close this reply. For though your letter is, in some sense, an appeal to the public, on the point of difference between us, it is an appeal to a tribunal which can only pass its opinion on the comparative strength of our respective positions, and upon our probable sincerity; but which can make no decision forcing the conscience of either of us. It may, however, be more satisfactory, not only to yourself, but to the public, that I should state my views upon the material points of your argument; and this I will now do.

The point of difference between us relates to the nature and extent of the action contemplated, and of the pledges given by the Buffalo platform.

We agree in fidelity, professed and actual, to these pledges; we agree in rejecting the Slavery resolutions of the late Democratic Convention; but we differ as to the question whether Democrats like ourselves, who cordially united in the Buffalo platform, and who yet faithfully hold to it, are, by its true sense and spirit, forbidden to vote for, and bound by, independent action, to oppose, the Democratic Nominees? In support of your view of the case, you dwell upon the Buffalo platform; the character of the convention by which it was adopted; the earnestness and enthusiasm with which the assembled thousands pledged themselves to abide by and maintain it; and you especially rely on the concluding resolution of the platform, in the following words: "Resolved, that we inscribe on our "banner Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labour, and "Free Men, and under it will fight on and fight "fight ever, until a triumphant victory shall reward "our exertions."

To give additional point to your argument, you quote the language of distinguished New York Democrats (some of whom did not attend the Buffalo Convention), who, in words of their own, expressed the like determination to do battle with the Slave Power, for the principles and objects named in this resolution. Extracts of this sort, and comments on them, occupy a considerable part of your letter; but as you have expressly disclaimed any intention to impugn the motives of others, I am spared the necessity of volunteering any remark upon these quotations or comments—the more especially as they have no legitimate bearing upon the question now at issue between you and myself.

I have no desire to explain away or qualify any of the pledges of the Buffalo platform. They bind us to opposition, perpetual and uncompromising, to the encroachments of the slave power, and to unceasing efforts for "Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labour and Free Men." But through what particular organization this perpetual opposition and these unceasing efforts were to be made, is not determined by the platform. It was left by the convention to the discretion of its members to decide for themselves, and according to their respective circumstances and relations, when, where, and how they were to render these services to the cause of freedom.

It was from the necessity of the case that this large discretion was left to each individual. For the Convention did not represent, nor attempt to represent, any particular constituency. It had no constituency, it was emphatically a mass convention. It had no permanent organization; no power of self-perpetration. All its officers and committees, all its arrangements and proceedings, in its organized capacity, were limited to the time and place, when and where it was assembled. The earnest and warm-hearted men, who composed it, had been drawn together by the sympathies and feelings appropriate to an emergency which demanded instant and vigorous action, to be performed in their collective capacity, so long as they should be together—in their individual capacities, or in other connections, so soon as they should be separated.

What these other connections should be, the Convention, when it separated, could not, in respect to any of its members, certainly know; but it was authorized to expect, from the assurances given by the Free Soil Democrats of New York, who took part in its proceedings, that they would be enabled through their State organization, then in existence, to secure to the Buffalo nominees the support of the radical Democracy.

These assurances were, as you admit, honourably redeemed.

You have given, with much minuteness, the history of the several conventions held in this State, during the years 1849, 1850, and 1851, for the purpose of reuniting the Democracy of the State, and, after this process had been effected, for the purposes of State Nominations.

You think the resolutions of the Mass Syracuse Convention, in 1849, at which a *quasi* union was effected, a serious retrogression from the position taken at Buffalo; and you deem the compromise resolutions, passed by the Syracuse Conventions of 1850 and 1851, a virtual abondonment of the positions previously maintained.

I was not a member of either of these conventions, nor had I any active agency in the measures which led to the reunion of the party. I ardently desired it, provided it could be effected on terms just and honorable to both sections; but the labour of attempting and finally accomplishing it fell chiefly upon others. I am sure they did all and the best that could be done; this you yourself admit. That you and your associates in Ohio effected a reunion on terms more satisfactory, was to us in New York especially gratifying. The pleasure was not lessened, perhaps even it was increased, by the contrast.

The resolution of the Mass Convention of 1849 did not satisfy me any more than yourself, as a basis of reunion; with the compromise resolutions of 1850 and 1851 I was wholly dissatisfied, and openly rejected them, though to protect the property and credit of the State, and to preserve the constitution, I deemed it a plain duty to support the nominees of the reunited party. Others, no doubt, took the same view.

In labouring, after the conflict of 1848 had terminated, to effect a reunion of the two sections of the New-York Democracy, the Free Soil Democrats of New York did nothing in the slightest degree repugnant to the pledges made at Buffalo. Such a reunion was necessary to regain the control of the State government; it was necessary to regain a Democratic representation in Congress. It was hoped and expected by yourself, and other Democratic Free Soilers from other States assembled at Buffalo, that so soon as such a union could be effected in this State, on just and honourable terms, it would take place.

The reunion, though not accompanied by such a declaration of principles as was wished, and earnestly contended for, by the Free Soil section of the party, was yet actually accomplished. It became a fixed fact. The two separate organizations were abandoned; a single organization for the whole State took their place. This, in itself and especially in reference to State interests, was a most desirable and important event. As one of its consequences, the individuals who composed the Free Soil Democratic organization have become merged in the re-united party. This party, of which they are members, was represented in the late Convention, by one and the same set of delegates. As stated at the beginning of this letter, the Free Soil Democrats of New York, though they regard themselves at liberty to reject, in whole or in part, the dogmas of the Convention, think themselves bound, by plain party obligations, to support the nominees. It would, therefore, be manifestly improper for them or me now to unite with you in organising an "Independent Democracy."

I do not perceive, in your letter, any censure of the Free Democracy of New York for their willingness to re-unite with their former associates. If the re-union could have been effected on terms proper and honourable, you would not have objected to it. The approbation with which you speak of the complete union effected in Wisconsin and Vermont, and of the partial union effected in Ohio and in Massachusetts, show that to union, in itself, provided it were obtained on just terms, you had no objections. The sentiment was very decisively manifested in your own action, in November, 1851, when you publicly declared your approbation of the platform adopted by the regular Democratic Convention of the State of Ohio—that by which Governor Wood was re-nominated for re-election—and your adhesion, on the principles of that platform, to the democracy of Ohio. I take no exception, whatever, to this action on your part; on the contrary, I thought it at the time, wise and patriotic. I submit, that it necessarily concedes the two points above stated—the right of every person who took part in the proceedings at Buffalo to decide for himself how, and in what political connection, his efforts in behalf of the principles there proclaimed were to be made; and the expediency, in the case of every Democrat concerned therein, of his making such efforts—supposing the opportunity to be fairly presented—in his former party connection, rather in any new one—in the old democratic party, as organized before 1848, rather than in the Free Democracy formed in that year. You must also, in fairness, concede, that if a re-union was ever to occur, it could only be by some concession on each side.

Neither section of a party so nearly equally divided could be expected to accept, without some modification, the former doctrine of the other.

In the same spirit, in the concluding part of your letter, you distinctly avow your own readiness to remain in the National Democratic organization—in which, as a part of the Ohio democracy, you were represented—provided the candidates and platform of the Convention had met your approbation. "Had a "liberal and tolerant spirit," these are your words, "prevailed in the Baltimore Convention; had no new "tests, incompatible with democratic principles, been "imposed; had the nominees represented that spirit, "and the ideas of reform, progress, liberty and econ-"omy embodied in the original platform, no division "need have occurred. The Convention is responsible "for the division. The Convention, which organized "compromise democracy upon new tests, created the "necessity for a radical and independent democracy."

The division to which, in this passage, you refer, is not the division produced by the Convention of 1848, but a new division produced by the Convention of 1852. The necessity for a radical and independent democracy to which you allude, is, in like manner, a necessity growing out of the action of the Convention of 1852. It is, therefore, not for the re-assembling of the Free Democracy of 1848, but for a new organization in 1852, of a new Free Democracy that you call. You inform us that you think it demanded by the action of the late Convention; and no one that knows you will doubt the sincerity of this statement. But from the very nature and necessity of the case, each of your late associates must be permitted to decide for himself whether the organization of a new party be necessary.

Even were it certain that the "independent action," in which you propose to engage, could be limited to the very objects and measures set forth in the Buffalo platform, I should, therefore, for the several reasons above stated, feel myself constrained to decline any participation therein.

But it is certain that it will not be so limited.

Several new questions connected with the subject of Slavery—all those, for example, growing out of the enactment of the several compromise acts of 1850—have arisen since 1848. No one of these questions was or could be then foreseen, in the precise form in which it is now before us—most of them are absolutely new.

Some of these questions are, no doubt, embraced within the principles of the Buffalo platform; but before I can be required to unite with you or others, in taking ground upon any new question, not anticipated at Buffalo, I must be permitted to examine into its character and merits, and to decide for myself as to the course I should pursue.

This is due to every member of the convention of August, 1848. It is especially due to the Free Soil Democracy of New York; for, however it may have been as to others, the Buffalo Convention, instead of being a starting-point, or a resting-place, was, with most of them, the place of termination in this particular path of public duty.

Now, on one at least of the new questions referred to—and, as it happens, the only one likely soon to become the subject of animated controversy, the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850—my opinions are entirely different from yours; and, if I may judge from the public prints, from those of all others, who are likely to take part in the proposed convention. You deny the power of Congress to legislate on the subject, and therefore hold the law of 1850, and that also of 1793, to be unconstitutional and void. For this reason, and also because of its objectionable features, you are prepared to urge, and if I correctly understand your views, think it your duty to urge, not merely the amendment of these laws, but their unconditional repeal.

Whatever I might have thought as to the constitutional power of Congress to legislate in this behalf, had the point arisen for the first, in 1850, I consider the power too firmly established, by the acquiescence of the whole nation in the act of 1793, and by the decisions of the judicial tribunals, to be now drawn in question. While, therefore, I regarded, with astonishment and regret, the enactment, by the American Congress, in the middle of the 19th century, of a new Fugitive Slave Law, more stringent and rigorous in its provisions than the act framed in the preceding century, when Slavery existed in three-fourths of the States—a law operating retrospectively and without limitation of time, so as to embrace persons who, though originally slaves, had been, for years, domiciled in the free States, and there bound by domestic and social relations, into which the supineness of the master, in the assertion of his rights, had perhaps enabled them to enter—a law totally deficient in appropriate safeguards for the protection of free men of colour, of whom, at the date of its enactment, there were over 400,000 in the free States—a law repugnant, in its very nature, to the feelings of Northern men—even of those most conscious of the duty of fulfilling the constitutional provision it was designed to maintain—and one, therefore, which should have been framed (if a new law were necessary) with careful regard to the sentiments and institutions of the free States, and with scrupulous attention to the rights of a large but defenceless class of free men—a law so defective in all the attributes of wise and considerate legislation as almost to justify the belief that it must have been designedly made so for the very purpose of exciting opposition at the North, and thus giving to Disunionists in the South new cause of complaint and agitation—while, therefore, I have regarded this law, ever since its passage, and still regard it, as a foul blot on the legislation of my country, I have never yet doubted its constitutionality.*

I should be most happy to see that law so amended as to make it consistent with the rules of justice and the claims of humanity; and I am ready to unite in any wise and hopeful effort to obtain such amendment. But I cannot consent to unite in a political organization founded in hostility to the continuance of the laws themselves, even though amended, on the statute-book. The reasons for this opinion cannot be stated here; but they seem to me to be perfectly consistent with all the pledges made at Buffalo.

When, therefore, in addition to the considerations before mentioned, it is further manifest that the proposed action is likely to embrace, if not designed to embrace, objects and measures not named in the Buffalo platform—objects and measures which my convictions will not permit me to promote—the reasons against my becoming a party to it are, as I trust you will have the candour to acknowledge, absolutely insuperable.

It is intimated by you, that many Democrats who took part in the Free Soil movement of 1848 are ready to take part in the like movement now. Your means of knowledge are much better than mine; but I confess I have seen no evidence of any such disposition, in any part of the country—there is no such disposition, to my knowledge, among the Democrats of New York. In this respect, the whole condition of things is totally different from that which existed in 1847; and unless the pledge binds us to disregard the most obvious rules of political prudence—and such, I think, cannot be its true interpretation—there would seem to be no good reason for, but at least one very good reason against, the movement you propose, viz., that it can do no possible good, and may do much harm, to the interests you desire to promote.

Your personal objections to General Pierce and Mr. King seem to me wholly insufficient to justify opposition to them as candidates. You admit "that you have no word to utter in disparagement of the just claims of either to respect and honour for their private virtues and public services." The objections are, that each of these gentlemen is an extreme supporter of Slavery; that each has treated Free Soil Democrats with intolerance, and denounced them in terms of harshness and severity; and that, in their letters of acceptance, they declared their decided approval of the Baltimore platform.

While I regard these things as no recommendation of the candidates, I cannot, without incurring myself the guilt of intolerance, magnify them into a ground of disqualification. They have but exercised, in the way which they, doubtless, have thought right, that freedom of thought, of utterance and of action, which, as it seems to me, those who prepared the Buffalo platform should be the last to deny or abridge.

You inquire, at the conclusion of your letter, what New York Democrats, who support the "compromise ticket," while in words rejecting the "compromise platform," expect to gain for freedom or for Free Soil Democracy, by supporting this ticket? "Is it," you ask, "that Free Soil Democrats will share in the pa-"tronage, or influence the action, of the administra-"tion?" For one, I answer, No! not at all. And whatever any might have thought, had I given to the ticket a silent support, yet, after the publication of this letter, I shall hope to be acquitted of entertaining any such expectation.

You suggest that General Pierce, in the event of his election, will feel himself specially engaged to guard the slave interest so far as relates to "the perpetuation "of Slavery" at the national capital, and "the perma-"nent maintenance, as irrepealable, of the Fugitive "Slave Law." In this apprehension, you are, I think, well warranted; for though I do not understand Gen. Pierce as committed to *veto* every bill amending the Fugitive Slave Law—for example, a bill which, without impairing the efficiency of that law, should yet make its provisions more consonant to humanity, and introduce proper safeguards for the protection of men of colour, who are neither slaves nor fugitives—yet I do understand him as disapproving any "agitation" of either of these two questions, Slavery in the District of Columbia and the Fugitive Slave Law. In former parts of this letter, I have stated in what respects, on what conditions, and why, I should desire legislation on this latter topic. If any bill conforming to the views above expressed by me should be passed by Congress, during Gen. Pierce's term of service, I should hope it would receive his approval. And if, from such a bill, his approval should be withheld, all hearts and voices in the free States would, at the next election, be united in the support of candidates pledged to re-enact the bill. Such a *veto* of such a bill would be a fatal victory to the Slave Power; for it would secure, in 1856, the election of a President untrammelled by a pro-slavery platform—a President pledged to carry out the popular will.

You also fear that "the efforts now being made to "introduce Slavery into California by an alteration of "the constitution, or a division of the State, and to "convert Utah and New Mexico into slaveholding ter-"ritories, with a view to the creation of slave States, "and to extend Slavery by insular or continental ac-"quisitions, in which the system now exists, or may be "established," will meet with no opposition from him or his associate nominee, if elected. Slavery in California or in any part of it, in whatever mode attempted to be introduced, can only be brought about by a change of the present State constitution, by the act of the people of California themselves. The federal government can have no agency in, or responsibility for, the measure, unless it be attempted through a division of the State—a step which cannot be taken without the consent of Congress. I think it altogether improbable that the people of California will ever divide the State for the express purpose, and with the actual effect, of creating a slave State. But if so improbable a thing shall actually occur, it will be for Congress, when it happens, to decide whether it shall be consented to—and for you and me, if then on the stage of action—and others who united with us in opposing Slavery extension in 1848—to arouse the friends of freedom, and, if needful, to repeat the efforts of that memorable year. And so, also, should Congress pass any of the bills suggested by you, for the purpose of establishing Slavery in the yet free soil of Utah and New Mexico or for the acquisition of slave territory now held by foreign States.

"Is it," you next ask, "that the other 'great inte-"rests of freedom and progress will be promoted," that anything will be done for "constitutional improve-"ments of the rivers and harbors" of the west—for "land reforms"—for "action or demonstration, by our "government, in favor of the nations of Europe con-"tending for freedom against despots?" For one to each of these enquiries, I answer "Yes." So far as either of these measures of policy is really constitutional, and necessary, and expedient, I expect them to be treated with favor by General Pierce; and I have no doubt that, under his administration, they will be far more effectively, as well as far more usefully, cared for, than under that of his whig competitor, to whose patronage your course, if successful, would commend them.

Whatever may have been the particular action of Gen. Pierce, in respect to river and harbor improvements, when a senator from New Hampshire—whatever may have been the opinions or the course of Virginia—whose delegates first named him as a candidate, in respect to either of these questions, I feel persuaded that, as President of the United States, General Pierce will treat with favour every just and constitutional measure for the promotion of the objects you have named. Extravagant and unconstitutinal schemes, legislative jobs, Quixotic enterprise of any and every kind—whether at home or abroad—deserve no favour from any one; and the belief that they will receive none from him, is one of my chief reasons for giving him my vote.

"Is it," you finally inquire:

"Is it that free-soil democrats expect that whatever may be the result of the pending election, the cause of freedom will still survive? that the principles of living democracy will still inspire determination to maintain right and resist wrong? that, at length, the slave power with all the oppression and injustice it upholds, with all its ostracism, social and political, of earnest friends of liberty, will be overthrown? and that our national government will become what our fathers designed it to be, a free government in fact as well as in name, with all its influence actively and perpetually on the side of freedom at home and throughout the world?"

To these questions—forming the climax of your appeal—you give your own reply, as follows:

"This expectation will not, I hope, be disappointed; but, if fulfilled, will not be through, but in spite of such action as that of the Baltimore Compromise Convention. The support of its nominees, I am firmly convinced, will not hasten, but retard its fulfilment."

I share with you this cheering expectation; and though I do not suppose that the support of the nominees presented to the country by the "Baltimore Compromise Convention" will directly hasten its fulfilment, yet, for the reasons already stated, and in view of all circumstances and relations present and prospective, this result will, I trust, be less permanently retarded by the election of the democratic nominees than by the course of action which you have decided on pursuing.

When I consider that, for the last thirty-four years the question of Slavery, in some one of its forms, has been constantly coming up for discussion, in and out of Congress; that the subject, in its very nature, appeals resistlessly to the hearts of philanthropists in every quarter of the Union—to the wise and cautious, as well as the imprudent and fanatical; that the very difficulties which environ it do but give it the stronger claim to the attention of reflecting men; that it is destined to be hereafter, as it has been for the few years past, not merely the gravest, but, however we may lament it, the most constantly recurring of our public questions—coming up not only with every petition to Congress for the abolition of Slavery in the district of Columbia, for its prohibition of Slavery in the territories of Utah and New Mexico, or for the repeal or amendment of the Fugitive Slave Law, but, as it were, frequently of a sudden, and when no man expects it, leaping into the arena of legislative debate, and asserting, for the time, its supremacy over all other topics: when I consider that, in the free States, some question connected with Slavery is continually under discussion—in the meetings of colonization, Anti-Slavery, abolition, and other societies, having a relation, more or less direct, to the general subject—in political and other assemblages—in the pulpit, in lectures, and through the press—by treatises on philosophy, morals and political economy—by historical, and other works, illustrating the evil consequences of the system—by romances and works of imagination, by tale and song—by periodical literature of the day, in all its forms and shapes:—when I consider that, in the slave States themselves, the like "agitation" is now going on, by discussions in the public press, and occasionally in legislative bodies, as to the expediency of emancipation, and the time and method of commencing and effecting it; the propriety or duty of so modifying existing laws as to protect the domestic relations and provide instruction among slaves; the duties of religious bodies of clergymen, and of masters towards them; the treatment to be extended to free persons of colour within the slave States, and especially to such as come within them in vessels belonging to the free States or foreign nations; the controversies which have grown out of the detention of free persons thus arriving in southern ports; and as to various other questions of a kindred nature:—when I consider, that independently of all home occasions giving rise to the agitation of this question, it is likely to be forced on us by our relations to Liberia, to Hayti, and to other foreign States:—and when I consider, above all, the nature which God has given to man, the instincts and faculties, the powers of thought and of utterance, with which he is endowed, and how in this late age, and in this new world, he is wont to insist on using these powers freely and without restraint, precisely in proportion to the attempts of tyrants to repress and crush them; when I consider, though ever so slightly, these and such like reflections, I am amazed at the shortsightedness and the folly, of platform builders at Baltimore; but I have no apprehensions for the cause of human freedom.

I wish the democratic nominee to be elected; that they and the democratic party may be charged with the entire responsibility of the government; that they may learn how impotent and futile are the behests of politicians, when they attempt to curb the free minds of a free people. A very short experience will, I think be sufficient to bring to their senses those who seem now to have forgotten alike the principles of the constitution and the lessons of history. But if not—if your fears should prove real, and the democratic party and its public servants should lend themselves to a crusade against freedom—still the duration of such misrule would be comparatively short. Four years in the history of the nation, are but as four days in the life of a man. And though this period is long enough for the accomplishment of much mischief, should men in power set themselves about it; yet in the virtue of and intelligence of the people, and in the favor of Providence, we may confidently hope for an early and ample corrective.

I have now, I believe, fully met all the material points of your letter, and have given you, with entire frankness, my views in respect to them. The decided character of your sentiments, and the deliberate and earnest manner in which you have expressed them, preclude any expectation on my part, that they will be in any respect changed, in consequence of anything contained in this communication. I am, therefore, compelled to anticipate a difference of opinion between us, very decided and more or less prolonged; but I will not deny myself the satisfaction of believing that it will neither interrupt nor impair the friendly relations which, since we were brought together in 1840, have hitherto existed between us.

I remain, with the highest respect and regard,
Very truly your friend,
B. F. Butler.

Hon. S. P. Chase.
U. S. Senator, Washington City.

The Pittsburg Convention.—There is an error in the report of the proceedings of the Convention, extensively published, that needs correction. It is said that on offering the resolution respecting the imprisonment of coloured seamen (which was adopted as a substitute for a resolution on the same subject reported by the platform committee), I "promised on the part of Gerrit Smith, and his friends, a cordial support of the platform, if it should be adopted." This is a mistake. I stated that, having consulted gentlemen on different sides of the house, I was authorized to say that if two of the resolutions, reported by the committee, should be stricken out and a new one adopted, it would meet the views of Mr. Smith and his friends, and be satisfactory to Messrs. Giddings, Adams, etc. The resolutions proposed to be stricken out were the following:

A. "That the early history of the Government clearly shows the settled policy to have been, not to extend, naturalize, and encourage, but to *limit, localize*, and discourage Slavery; and to this policy, which should never have been departed from, the Government ought forthwith to return."

B. "That Slavery is a sin against God, and a crime against man, the enormity of which no law nor usage can sanction or mitigate, and that Christianity and Humanity alike demand is abolition."

The sentiment in resolution A is particularly offensive to those who believe that the Government had at first nothing to do with Slavery, and that after undoing what it has done in sustaining and extending it, Government ought to cease all interference with the accursed thing. The sentiment in resolution B is good, so far as it goes, but it was thought desirable to substitute the following in lieu of it:

C. "That American Slavery being a sin against God, and a crime against man, it is, in the highest sense, invalid, illegal, not law, either divine or human, and is, therefore, utterly VOID, and OF NO FORCE, before God and man."

As Mr. Smith, and those who agree with him, were very desirous of having Slavery declared "illegal," it was thought that the sentiment, as expressed in resolution C, would meet their concurrence, as well as the approbation of the rest of the Convention, and thus produce harmonious and unanimous action in favour of the platform on the final vote.—Debate, however, ensued, different views were expressed, and finally the following was adopted as a substitute for resolutions B. and C:

D. "That Slavery is a sin against God, and a crime against man, which no law or usage can make right, and that Christianity, humanity and patriotism, alike demand its abolition."

Mr. Smith expressly stated that he would acquiesce in the platform, so far as Slavery is concerned, had resolutions A and B been stricken out, and resolution C been adopted; but as only resolution A was expunged, and resolution C was refused, neither he nor his friends are *bound* to the acquiescence suggested, although many of them may, for aught I know, support the platform, which is the best ever adopted by the FREE DEMOCRACY. Alarm seemed to be produced—needlessly, I thought—about the introduction of the term "illegal" in resolution C.; for, in its connection, it seems to follow as a sequence to the expression, in which all were agreed, that "Slavery is a sin against God and a crime against man." As sin cannot be christianized, so neither can crime be *legalized*, in the true sense of LAW.

Allow me to add that there was no plotting, intrigue, or management in procuring the nomination of Mr. Hale, nor in preventing the nomination of Mr. Chase or any other person. Mr. Hale was nominated on account of his principles and popularity, without reference to the effect the nomination would have on the nominees of the other parties. The motto was—PRINCIPLES, NOT MEN. LEWIS TAPPAN.

N. B.—Editors who have published the proceedings of the Convention are respectfully requested to insert the above.—*Tribune.*

——Probable Kidnapping.—About three weeks ago a poor family residing at the South End, was called upon by a mulatto for the avowed purpose of hiring a son of their's, to tend a barber's shop for him. As the mulatto was a perfect stranger the mother refused his proposal; but the boy, who was standing near, acting upon the impulse of the moment, consented to go off with him, and staid about a week, returning to the house every evening. About a week ago the man called again, and wished the mother's consent to let the boy go to the shop and stay till his return, stating that he was going to Philadelphia as cook of a brig. The boy, having gone down on the wharf to see him off, the mulatto decoyed him on board the vessel, since which no information has been received of the boy's whereabouts. The father has proceeded to Philadelphia, and probably the mulatto's movements and intentions will soon be known.—*Boston Transcript.*

---

*See Virginia Resolutions of December 21st, 1798, drawn by Madison; the Kentucky Resolutions of November 19th, 1798, drawn by Jefferson; and Madison's Report of 1800.

*That part of the 10th section which provides that a record, made up in one State, to prove that a man, then actually domiciled in another State, owes service or labour to the party who procures the record to be so made up, shall be conclusive evidence, is null and void, because contrary to the first principles of civilized jurisprudence; but it is not unconstitutional. It, however, illustrates the character of the law.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

††† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JAC

seem to threaten the Corner-stone of our Republican Edifice. In that case, if they give us bowls, they look for rubbers.

But we do not discern any such emergency "looming in the Future," as the English Chancellor of the Exchequer says, at least in the *near* Future. John Bull loves Cotton-cloth almost as well as we do the Raw Material; and it will be a great provocation that will drive him to prevent Supply and Demand from rushing into one another's arms. We are said to have found great help from our Cotton Bags at New Orleans in 1815, and we shall continue to entrench ourselves behind them, until we are destroyed at the point of the bayonet. And the bayonets at the point of which we must be driven from them, if ever, will not be from the other side of the Atlantic. There is not spirit enough left in the Nation to fight for *Rights*. There is physical *pluck* enough to fight—but it must be for *Wrongs*, as long as we submit to be ridden by the dirty oligarchy that seems "to have come into the world booted and spurred," as Jefferson said of the kings of Europe, for that express and pre-ordained purpose. So long Cotton will lord it over Codfish.—E. Q.

LIFE AT THE SOUTH.

If Mrs. Stowe, or any other writer of fiction, could have to revealed them all the cases of devilish cruelty which transpire in any one week of the year in the Southern States and should weave them into a story, and publish them to the world, the work would be pronounced a most incredible and horrible fiction. The Slaveholders, however, are too wise to tell often of the terrible incidents which are constantly occurring among them, and if one is related and published, it is hinted at as the exception and not as the rule in Southern life, or if told on any other authority than that of Slaveholders is dismissed with the easy plea that it is an 'Abolition lie.'

But here are three facts, all of which have come to us within a week, and two of them through public Southern newspapers. Perhaps half a hundred others equally atrocious have occurred within the same time, and any other week in the year could show a like number. It only happens that they are not told; not that the three here related happened to occur within a given time.

The first is related in the *Richmond* (Va.) *Times*, as follows:

Negro Shot.—A gentleman named Ball, overseer for Edward T. Tayloe, residing in King George Co., Va., finding it necessary to chastise a field hand for insolence or idleness, attempted to do so in the field, when the negro resisted, and gave the overseer a severe beating. Mr. Ball mounted his horse and proceeded to Mr. Tayloe's residence, and informed him what had occurred. Mr. T. in company with Ball, repaired to the corn field, to which the negro had returned, and demanded to know the cause of his conduct. The negro replied that Mr. Ball had attempted to whip him, but he would not submit to it. Mr. Tayloe told him he should and ordered him to cross his hands, and directed Mr. Ball to take hold of him. Mr. B. did so—but perceiving he had drawn a knife told Mr. Tayloe of it, who immediately sprang from his horse and, drawing a pistol from his pocket, shot the negro dead at his feet.

Of course the case had no legal investigation, as Mr. Tayloe did no more than the law would permit. It would lead to all sorts of insubordination in Virginia if a master was denied the privilege of shooting his negroes whenever he thought the discipline of the plantation required it.

But here is a still more striking case. It is told by the *Richmond* (Va.) *Republican*—Republican! Heaven help us!

The True Plan.—Some few days since an overseer on one of the large river plantations below this city, where hundreds of negroes are constantly employed, was met by a negro man in a ravine, on the outskirts of the plantation, beaten in a most cruel manner, without cause or provocation, and would have been thrown into a deep marl pit close by and instantly killed, but for the timely aid rendered by an old negro, who came to the rescue of his manager and saved his life. The whole affair transpired within full view of a number of the negroes, who, during the fight were frequently ordered to his relief by the overseer, not one of whom budged a peg. Here was a crisis to be promptly met and overcome, for if conquered by one of the slaves, and the others permitted to disobey the orders of their overseer with impunity, he felt that his life was always in peril, and his services of no value to his employer. But he was not the man to submit to such treatment, or to throw up his command, so he repaired instantly to his house, and arming himself for another conflict, returned to the scene of his late defeat, where, finding the headman on the farm, the negro who had beat him, and a number of others together, he ordered the headman to seize the rebel. The fellow refused to obey the order, when he was instantly shot down in his tracks. A second man was ordered to lay hold of the fighting negro, but failing to do so, was fired upon and fell.—A third one shared the same fate as the first two, and a fourth one would have been similarly treated had he not obeyed the command of his superior with alacrity, and with the aid of other fellow servants harnessed up the belligerant to be appropriately dealt with. We glory in the spirit of that overseer, and will add that his determination to be obeyed and to conquer will have a more salutary effect upon the black herd around him who are under his control, than the hanging, by the law, of an hundred negroes. Had Mr Gentry of this city, upon whom a hatchet was drawn a few days since, been as resolute and determined as the gentleman we have just been writing about, the example would have had a more salutary effect upon the negroes under his charge, than all the whipping he can inflict between now and Christmas. Our plan for managing negroes is to feed them well, clothe them well, work them well, see that they are at home at proper hours of the night, and if they do not behave themselves in a becoming manner to *whip* them well; and if *necessary* to enforce obedience, shoot them as full of bullets as a sand seive is of holes

Has the law anything to say to this? Not at all.—The only influence it has, probably, upon the fortunes of the overseer—in whose "spirit" the *Republican* glories—is, possibly, that the neighbouring planters would pay extra wages for the services of so spirited a fellow, and so excellent an overseer. That he is a cowardly, as well as a cruel wretch, would no more occur to them than it does to the Richmond editor. A common overseer, or master, only shoots the offending slave. This villain would not only shoot him, but does not hesitate to murder, one after the other, three men, who, after all, perhaps, only disobeyed his orders because they feared to encounter a man with whom the overseer himself did not dare to meddle.—And this an influential public journal pronounces the 'true plan.'

The other incident comes to us on the authority of a gentleman in Washington, whose word is not to be questioned, and has also been related to us by another who was in that city when it occurred. We have hesitated to publish it, but acts of this character, which publicly occur, may sometimes be publicly told, however revolting or indelicate their details may be. We have only to caution our readers to read it to themselves, and not aloud. We give it in the words of the gentleman first alluded to:

"A mulatto girl, about eighteen years of age, nearly white, and of rare personal beauty, owned by Mr. ——, now a resident of this city, who came in possession of her by marriage with a North Carolina lady, was suspected by her owner, in consequence of certain anonymous communications received by him, of improper intimacy with gentlemen. Accordingly, he provided himself with a cowhide for the purpose of punishing her whenever the fact should be discovered. On the 5th of July, after the girl had returned from viewing the fire-works, as Mr. —— and his wife were about retiring for the night, he ordered the girl to go to her room in the attic and get her night clothes for the purpose of remaining for the night in the room of her mistress, who was quite unwell. The girl remained longer than he thought was necessary, whereupon he took his cowhide and proceeded up stairs. Just as he passed the door of the room of Mr. ——, a Southern member of Congress, he saw the girl come out of it. He immediately seized her, and, to use his own language, "cowhided her like d——nation;" the member of Congress remaining all the time in his room, hearing the shrieks of his defenceless victim and never offering to interpose. The girl was then sent sobbing and crying to her mistress, while high words (nothing more) passed between the two chivalrous Southern gentlemen. Soon Mr. —— returned to his room, and there learned that the girl had told her mistress that she had been punished for talking with "the gentleman." He immediately charged her with lying, and promised to whip her again the next morning. Accordingly, in the morning, he stripped off her naked to the waist, and gave her, as he said, fifty lashes upon her bare back, making the girl confess the particulars of her guilt.—By her confession, it appeared that the member of Congress had succeeded in accomplishing his purpose through the influence of the chambermaid, and that the proceeds of her guilt had been applied to the purchase of a dress and hat. Mr. —— then proceeded to the girl's chamber, took the dress and hat, carried them into the back yard, and there made a bonfire of them as a spectacle to the boarders and inmates of the house. It appears that in the quarrel between Mr. —— and the member of Congress, the former threatened to expose the latter unless he immediately left the house, and, as he did not do so, he carried his threat into execution, heralding forth this tale of scandal and cruelty, which, while it exposes the licentiousness and shame of the member of Congress, exhibits his own disgusting brutality and fiendish barbarity. Such is but one of the many pictures of the moral results of the institution of Slavery. If Mr. —— had not made public the transaction by his own mouth to numerous witnesses, this statement of it would probably never have been exposed in public print."

General Pierce and the Fugitive Slave Law.—We have published, in former numbers of the *Standard*, the charge made by certain New Hampshire papers against Gen. Pierce, that, in a speech made last winter, at New Boston, N. H., he denounced the Fugitive Slave Law. The accusation first appeared in the (Washington) *Republic*, who hoped by it to injure the prospects of the Democratic candidate at the South, and implying, at the same time, that no such heresy could be imputed to the Whig nominee, Gen. Scott. *The* (Washington) *Union* has met the slander with great indignation, and the Southern Democratic press, generally, has repelled it with far more feeling than they would have displayed had Gen. Pierce been accused of having served his time in the Penitentiary for horse-stealing or burglary. Both parties to this controversy, we have no doubt, are right, and both, at the same time, wrong. The Whigs are undoubtedly correct in the accusation they bring against Gen. Pierce, that he denounced the Fugitive Slave Law; and the Democrats are quite as certainly right in maintaining that he heartily approves of it. A correspondent in New Hampshire, whose veracity cannot be questioned, says, in a private letter: "You hear much said about Gen. Pierce's speech at New Boston. He is reported as saying, that '*he loathed* the Fugitive Slave Law,' &c.; and you may depend on the statement made under oath by the Rev. Mr. Foss, who took minutes of the speech. Mr. Foss' character for truth is unimpeachable. He published the remarks of Gen. Pierce soon after they were delivered, and the statement has never been denied till since Pierce was nominated for the Presidency. You will observe that not one of Pierce's friends, who deny the statement of Foss, dare *make oath to their denial*." The *Republic* should thank us for this extract from the letter of our correspondent, and compel the *Union* either to acknowledge the charge against its candidate, or to bring forward some of Gen. Pierce's less conscientious friends, who had as lief swear to a lie as tell it.

The Tribune thinks that John Van Buren is improving. At the great Democratic Celebration last week at Hillsborough, N. H., Gen. Peirce's birth place, after listening to letters and speeches from various Southern men, bragging that he would carry every Southern State, and that

"His election will inflict a severe, if not a mortal wound upon political Abolition. The agitators will learn that sectional issues are the pathways to political death," &c., &c.

'John', continues the *Tribune*, 'went into the Cotton line himself,' being thus reported in the *Boston Post*, in its account of a meeting at Faneuil Hall:

Capt. Rynders, of the New York Empire Club, was the next speaker introduced, and was followed by

John Van Buren, of New York, who *entered into a history of the Compromises. He expressed his belief that the Constitution secured the right of the South to recover fugitives, and that the Constitution must be lived up to.* Mr Van Buren made one of his characteristically able speeches, which was frequently applauded. At the close, three cheers were given for the Empire State and for Mr. Van Buren.

Van Buren, Stanton, *et id omne genus*, have not the grace to pretend to blush at their political profligacy. They have not even the negative merit of hypocrisy. Crime is no longer looked upon as mischievious when it ceases to be secret, for then the criminal is held to be a lunatic; so nobody can hold these men now as accountable moral beings, and they are permitted to go at large, and almost disregarded, because they are as harmless as any drunken old 'uncle' of a country village, the scoff and sport of the boys, who, by making a beast of himself, harms no one else.

The Foreign Slave-Trade.—The extinction of the Slave-Trade on the Coast of Africa has been repeatedly announced of late, with how much truth may be seen by the intelligence received by the last arrival from England. We may safely predict that the old law of supply and demand will hold good a while longer in spite of blockading squadrons, however large and however watchful.

News from Africa.

Two steamers with 1,000 slaves lately got away from the Gallinas. A large armed slaver, with ten guns and Spanish colours, is reported to be cruising off the Gallinas. H. M. brig Crane, Lieutenant Bonham, had left Sierra Leone in pursuit, and returned on the 11th July. On the same day, H. M. steamer Pluto left for St. Vincent's, Cape Verde, to convey the English mails of the 15th July to Sierra Leone. When cruising off Sherboro, a boat was seen in the river, painted like and supposed to belong to one of our men-of-war; she however turned out to belong to a lave vessel which passed the Crane at night, with 400 laves, and got clear. The Governor of Sierra Leone had received information of 1,000 slaves being ready for embarkation within ten miles of Mrs. Lightbourne's factory, in the Rio Pongos, with every preparation made for resistance until the "stock" leave the barracoons.

☞ It is stated in the *Pennsylvania Freeman* that "George Thompson since his defeat in the Tower Hamlets, has been elected to Parliament from the Scotch "University of Aberdeen." We had previously noticed the return of a G. Thompson from Aberdeen, but supposed it to be another person than the rejected representative of Tower Hamlets.—*Tribune*.

The Tribune's first impression, we are inclined to think, was correct, and our friend of the *Freeman* mistaken. Had the late representative of the Tower Hamlets been returned for the University at Aberdeen, we should probably have heard of it more directly than through newspaper report.

More Caving.—David Wilmot, of Pa., the man who had greatness thrust upon him, by the conjunction of his name with the proviso prohibiting Slavery in the Territories, was, it seems, carried down by the caving-in at Baltimore which H. B. Stanton so glorified in Tammany Hall. He is wallowing in the sand with Van Buren, Dix, and the rest of them, and shouting for Pierce and King.

Attempt to Sell a Free Woman as a Slave.—Oscar R. Mitchell, lately from Cincinnati, was arraigned before the City court of Louisville, on Saturday, 7th inst., upon the charge of holding in Slavery, and attempting to sell, a free woman of colour, called Elizabeth Lane. By the evidence, it appeared that the girl was a free person, said to have been born at Portsmouth, Ohio: that she resided in cincinnati, at the house of the accused, who was a married man, and was always reputed free; that they had a quarrel, and the girl left; that Ann Holley a woman of ill-fame, made a bill of sale for the girl to Mitchell, without receiving any compensation, but afterwards said that it was for the purpose of enabling Mitchell to sell her in the South, and she (Ann Holley) was to have half the money received. The girl it appears, got to know something of this bill of sale, and afterwards, when Mitchell tried to get her to go to Louisville with him, she refused, until he assured her, in presence of witnesses, that he had no claim upon her, and that the bill of sale had been burned. The proof further showed that in Louisville, Mitchell and his wife seized the girl as a slave, and exhibited the bill of sale as evidence of title. Mitchell was held to bail in $1,500. The punishment for the offence is confinement in the Penitentiary, not less than five, nor more than ten years.

——We learn from the Easton, Md., *Gazette*, that a few nights ago, in Caroline County, two men made arrangements to meet a slave named Tom, near Greensborough, and that Tom having informed his master of the affair, four white men accompanied him to the spot, and found the two strangers there in a carriage. Mr. Dill caught hold of the vehicle to arrest them, when he received a ball through his ear, narrowly escaping with his life. Another of the whites who caught hold of the horses, was also fired at without effect. The supposed kidnappers then made their escape, but were pursued, and one of them, named Wicks, arrested at Dover, Del. The other, named Dorrity, made his escape. These men keep a small store at a place called Sandtown, near the Maryland line, and the *Gazette* says they make it a regular business to entice slaves away *in order to secure the reward for their re-capture*,

Communications.

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN.

Mr. Editor: Feeling a profound interest in Mrs. Stowe's "Uncle Tom's Cabin," I wish to avow my feelings and thoughts in regard to it. I purchased the work one Saturday night, and the next morning I rose very early, and, believing that I should be as well employed in reading "Uncle Tom" as in attending any pro-slavery church in the vicinity, I commenced Vol. I., and closed it—read every word of it—before I retired. On Monday morning, I commenced Vol. II. early, and read until school time—resumed it at the close of the afternoon session, and read the remainder by 10 or 11 o'clock, P. M., and can truly say that it is to me the most pathetic, touching and thrilling human composition that I ever read. The *contemplation* of many things recorded in few words and comparatively simple and plain style in the Book of sacred lore—as, for instance, the love of God, and the birth, life, love, sufferings and death of Christ—is of thrilling, momentous and transcendent interest to the devout contemplative mind, as the plain pictures are coloured and made life-like by the imagination. But, in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," they are "drawn to the life"—life-like daguerreotypes of Slavery *as it is*, and drawn in such vivid colours that no time for reflection or aid of fancy is needed to fill out the picture, for, soon as it strikes the eye, it becomes truly, to the mental ken, a *tangible*, "*living, dramatic reality*." I can fully and with all my heart and soul endorse the glowing eulogy which you, sir, and thousands of others have bestowed upon the work, and can say with one of your editorial brethren, that "the man that can read 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' without shedding tears should be commended to Barnum." It appears to me certain that, to many who are indifferent or ignorant in reference to the evils of Slavery, it will be a trumpet blast to rouse their attention and incite them to action, and that to many negro-hating, Slavery defenders or apologists, whose hearts are apparently as morally hard as the nether millstone or adamantine rock, it will be as Moses' rod was to Horeb—that it will cause the fount of sympathy to gush forth from hearts unused to feel and eyes unused to weep—at least for the poor slave. I have, for over 10 years, been an almost constant reader on the Slavery question. I have read, and still read, *both sides* of it—Anti-Slavery and Pro-Slavery. I have eagerly read the writings and speeches of Garrison, Giddings, Phillips, Parker, Beecher, Douglass, May, Hale, and many others,

"Whose eloquence has raised the soul to flame—
Caught every nerve and quivered through the frame,"

and made the "veins run lightning"—but, without bating a jot of the merit which I accord to them, or the esteem with which I regard them, or meaning aught of disparagement, I must say that, in exciting and retaining a powerful hold on the sympathies and causing tears to flow, it surpasses any and everything besides that I ever met with, especially that part which relates to the death of little Eva. Those parts of the work which appeal to our mirthfulness are, perhaps, nearly or quite as graphically drawn as any of the rest, and are almost as great a tax upon our risibilities as the pathetic parts are upon our sympathies. The pathetic portions of it naturally, and it would seem almost irresistibly, excite unutterable emotions of sympathy for the oppressed, and amazement at the turpitude and cruelty of the oppressor. By the term oppressor, I mean men at the North as well as South—men who preach or palliate as well as those who *practice* oppression—inasmuch as they are *particeps criminis*, and more guilty in fact than the South. I read much of the book with tearful eyes and heaving breast. I have shed more tears over it than I ever did over any or all other books together. Unlike the common, trashy, ephemeral novels of the day, it is calculated to do something more than merely make the reader weep over tales of "Love and Murder," and immoral tragical stories of moral life, inasmuch as it is thoroughly imbued with a moral and religious tone, and is thereby eminently calculated "to wake the genius and to mend the heart." It does seem as if no person, at the North especially, could be so hard-hearted as to read it unmoved, much less to cavil with it and treat it with indifference or contempt. But, so it is. There are instances of the kind even among the professed followers of the blessed Saviour, not only among politicians and printers, but among priests and people. The *New York Observer*, one of the most popular so-called religious journals—one which wields a potent influence in the community—notices it in a cavilling way. But, surprising as this may be to some not conversant with such pro-slavery papers as the *Observer*, *Journal of Commerce* and *Express*, it is "no more than was expected" by those who closely watch their course. They palliate and virtually defend Slavery, and advocate slave-catching, and pervert and press in the Bible to their support, and in all this they are backed up by such "reverend," time-serving pharisees as Drs. Spring, Lord, Cox and Dewey, and are *cheek-by-jowl* with Bennett's *Herald*, which, though a powerful panderer to vice and a willing receptacle of blackguardism, sophistry, slander and slang, is perhaps, after all, morally as good as the *Observer*. How humiliating it is to see religious teachers and religious editors—"falsely so called"—exhibit such lamentable moral obtuseness and turpitude, such as we should expect to find only in the most avowedly irreligious and unprincipled scoundrels! To see them "put on the livery of the court of Heaven to serve the devil in," and, in the sacred garb of religion, propagate as rank infidelity and atheism "as was ever spawned from hell!" But, humiliating as these things are, let no philanthropist be the least dejected, when there is such a general waking-up and growing interest on the subject of Slavery. Mrs. Stowe's work has given a powerful impulse to the glorious Cause, and, despite time-serving politicians, presses and priests, the work will have a lasting influence. Many who were too prejudiced or too timid to read an Anti-Slavery paper or pamphlet have been induced by the quaintness of the title of the work and its unprecedented popularity to peruse it, and are now strong Anti-Slavery. As Abolitionists, let us thank God and take courage, resolved to be "faithful unto death" in the advancement of the righteous Cause; and let us not cease to invoke the speedy coming of the glorious time, "foretold in prophecy and invoked in poetry," when Truth, Right and Righteousness shall universally prevail, when

"Prone to the dust, Oppression shall be hurled;
Her name and nature withered from the world!"

August 1, 1852. D. H. W••••

Rochester, August 6, 1852.

To the Editor of the Standard:

Remembering your invitation for accounts of Anti-Slavery meetings, I submit a brief sketch of my recent tour.

Being on a visit to my friends, Henry and Dorcas Collins, in Waterloo, arrangements were made for my talking to a small audience in the Congregational friends' meeting house, on Sunday, July 18th. I afterwards accompanied them to a family *re*-union in Cayuga county, enjoying, enroute, the pleasant passage across by steamer, and the beautiful scenery, for which the shores of Cayuga Lake are so attractive. During the ride, our eyes were greeted with smiling orchards and fields of waving grain, evincing that the husbandman would reap an abundant reward for his labours.

It was gratifying to find several Anti-Slavery families, and be made welcome to their hospitalities. I am much indebted to Isaac Jacobs for a generous promotion of my meeting on July 25th, and would make honourable mention of Rev. Mr. Graves, of the Presbyterian Church at Northville, who granted his pulpit and exerted an influence that secured me an intelligent and attentive audience, participating very faithfully in the exercises himself. I felt encouraged for the sake of the cause, regarding it as a Sabbath day's journey in the right path.

There is, as you well know, an increasing need of light being diffused among the people on the abominable Colonisation scheme now so rampant in the nation. Anti-Slavery lecturers have not devoted as much attention to it as it seems to me demanded; and now, while rearing its snaky head, displaying its forked tongue, is the time when well-directed blows may prove effective. Yours for Human Rights,

Wm C Nell.

GENERAL SCOTT.

The following remarkable passage occurring in the speech of Judge Johnson, of Ohio, at the Lundy Lane pow-wow, on the 28th of July, in relation to the prospects of Gen. Scott for the Presidency, is worth remembering. It was published in the *Tribune* of July 29, and is undoubtedly correct: "They had brought the cause before the great, glorious and unpacked jury of the whole people, who would write '*Mene mene tekel upharsin*' upon his enemy's brow, and give him a glorious verdict." What an elevation to the Presidency this would be! But a righteous and glorious verdict, nevertheless, both in the case of Winfield Scott and Franklin Pierce. Justice, however, in the present state of politics, cannot be meted out to both these men. One of them will undoubtedly, if life is spared, go into the Presidential chair, however legible '*Tekel*' may stand written upon his brow. Ulric.

Foreign Correspondence.

From our London Correspondent.

First of August in London—George Thompson—F. W. Kellogg—Wm. W. Brown—Americans abroad—An ex-editor turned up—Course of Kossuth in this country—Fugitive Slaves in England—Interview of Lady Byron with one of them—Rev. John Scoble, and his title to be a teacher of Coloured Americans.

Dear Standard: It may not be uninteresting to your readers to know that the Anniversary of West India Emancipation was celebrated here on Monday last. But little notice of the intended meeting had been given, yet the capacious lecture room of St. Martin's Hall, was filled, at an early hour, with a most respectable audience, who appeared to have assembled for the sake of the cause.

Our old and well-tried friend, Geo. Thompson, Esq., was unanimously called to preside, and he opened the proceedings with one of his characteristic speeches. The meeting was then addressed by the Rev. Wm Douglass, a coloured clergyman of Philadelphia, in a most eloquent and feeling manner. Mr. Douglass is a man of fine native talent.

Francis W. Kellogg, of the United States, was the next speaker. Mr. Kellogg is an advocate of temperance, of some note, I believe, in his own country, and has been lecturing with considerable success in Great Britain. He is one of the most peculiar speakers I have ever heard. Born in Massachusetts, and brought up in the West, he has the intelligence of the one, and the roughness of the other. He has the retentive memory of Wendell Phillips, the overpowering voice of Frederick Douglass, and the too rapid gestures of Dr. Delany. He speaks faster than any man I ever heard, except C. C. Burleigh. His speech, which lasted more than an hour, was one stream of fervid eloquence. He gave us a better idea of a real American stump orator than we ever had before. Altogether, he is the best specimen of the rough material out of which great public speakers are manufactured, that I have yet seen. Mr. Kellogg's denunciations of Clay and Webster (the dead lion and the living dog), reminded us of Wendell Phillips; his pictures of Slavery called to memory Frederick Douglass in his palmiest days, and his rebuke of his own countrymen for their unchristian prejudice against colour, brought before us the favourite topic and best speeches of C. L. Remond. It was his maiden speech on the subject of Slavery, yet it was the speech of the evening.

Wm. Wells Brown, who has been in England for some time, and who is always sure of a warm reception at the hands of an English audience, was the next speaker. Mr. Brown's daughters, who are now in one of the best schools in London, were also present.

Hatred to oppression is so instilled into the minds of the people in Great Britain, that it needs but little to arouse their enthusiasm to its highest point; yet we here can scarcely comprehend the real condition of the slaves of the United States. We have heard of the buying and selling of men, women, and children, without any regard to the tenderest ties of nature; of the passage and execution of your infamous Fugitive Slave Law, and, as we walk through the streets of London, we occasionally meet an American slave, who reminds us of the fact that while your countrymen are boasting of their liberty, and offering an asylum to the exiled of other countries, they refuse it to their own citizens.

Much regret has been expressed on this side of the Atlantic, that Kossuth should have kept so silent on the Slavery question, while in America; and this act alone has, to a great extent, neutralized his further operations in this country. He certainly is not the man now that he was before his visit to the New World.

I seldom pass through the Strand or other great thoroughfares of the metropolis without meeting countrymen of yours. I encountered one a short time since under peculiar circumstances. It was one of those days commonly experienced in London, of half cloud and half sunshine, with just fog enough to give everything a grey appearance, that I was loitering through Drury Lane, and came upon a crowd of poor people and street beggars who were being edified by an exhibition of Punch and Judy, on the one hand, and an organ grinder, with a well dressed and intelligent looking monkey, on the other. Punch looked happy and was performing with great alacrity, while the organ-grinder with his loud toned instrument was furnishing music for the million. Pushing my way through the crowd, and taking the middle of the street for convenience sake, I was leaving the infected district in greater haste than I entered it. I had scarcely taken my eyes off the motley group, when I observed a figure approaching me from the opposite direction and walking with a somewhat hasty step. I have seen so much oddity in dress and the general appearance of members of the human family, that my attention is seldom ever attracted by the uncivilized look of any one. But this being whom I was meeting, and whose appearance was such as I had not seen before, threw the monkey and his companions entirely in the shade. In fact, all that I had beheld in the great exhibition, of a ludicrous nature, dwindled away into utter insignificance when compared to this Robinson Crusoe looking man; for after all it turned out to be a man. He was of small stature, and, although not a cold day, his person was enveloped in a heavy over-coat, which looked as if it had seen some service, and had passed through the hands of some of the second-hand gentlemen of Brattle Street, Boston. The trousers I did not see, as they were benevolently covered by the long skirts of the above garment. A pair of patent leather boots covered a small foot. The face was entirely hidden by a huge beard, apparently from ten to fifteen inches in length, and of a reddish colour. Long dark hair joined the beard, and upon the head was thrown, in a careless manner, one of those hats known in America as the wide-awake, but here as the billy-cock. A pair of bright eyes were entirely hid by the hair around the face. I was not more attracted by his appearance than astonished at the man stopping before me, as if he knew me. I now observed something like smoke emanating from the long beard round the mouth; I was immediately seized by the individual by his right hand, while the left hand took from his mouth a pipe about three inches in length, stem included, and, in a sharp shrill voice, sounding as if it came from the interior of a hogshead, or from a sepulcher, he called me by my name. I stood for a moment and eyed the figure from head to foot, "from tip to toe," to see if I could discover the resemblance of any one I had ever seen before. After satisfying myself that the object was new, I said, "Sir, you have the advantage of me." "Don't you know me?" he exclaimed in a still louder voice. I looked again and shook my head. "Why," said he, "it is Clapp." I stepped back a few feet, and viewed him once more from top to bottom, and replied, "You don't mean to say that this is Henry Clapp?" "Yes, it is he, and nobody else." After taking another look, I said, "Ain't you mistaken, sir, about this being Henry Clapp?" "No," said he, "I am sure I know myself." So I very reluctantly had to admit that I was standing in presence of the ex-editor of the *Lynn Pioneer and Herald of Freedom*. Indeed, one meets with strange faces in a walk through the streets of London. But I must turn again to the question of Slavery.

Some months since, a lady, apparently not more than fifty years of age, entered a small dwelling on the estate of the Earl of Lovelace, situated in the county of Surrey. After ascending a flight of stairs, and passing through a narrow passage, she found herself in a small but neat room, with plain furniture. On the table lay copies of the *Liberator* and *Frederick Douglass' Paper*. Near the window sat a young woman, busily engaged in sewing, with a spelling book laying open on her lap. The light step of the stranger had not broken the silence enough to announce the approach of any one, and the young woman still sat at her task, unconscious that any one was near. A moment or two, and the lady was observed, when the diligent student hastily rose and apologized for her apparent inattention. The stranger was soon seated, and in conversation with the young woman. The lady had often heard the word "slave," and knew something of its application, but had never before seen one of her own sex who had actually been born and brought up in a state of chattel Slavery; and the one in whose company she now was, was so white, and had so much the appearance of an educated and well-bred lady, that she could scarcely realize that she was in the presence of an American slave. For more than an hour, the illustrious lady and the poor exile sat and carried on a most familiar conversation. The thrilling story of the fugitive often brought tears to the eyes of the stranger. Oh, how I would that every half-bred, aristocratic, slaveholding, woman-whipping, negro-hating woman of America could have been present and heard what passed between these two distinguished persons. They would for once have seen one who, though moving in the most elevated and aristocratic society in Europe, felt it an honour to enter the small cottage and take a seat by the side of a poor hunted and exiled American fugitive slave. Let it be rung in the ears of the thin-skinned aristocracy of the United States, who would rather receive a flogging from the cat-o'-nine-tails than to sit at the table of a negro, that Lady Noel Byron, widow of the great poet, felt it a peculiar pleasure to sit at the table and take tea with Ellen Craft. It must, indeed, be an interesting fact to your readers, and especially to those who are acquainted with the facts connected with the life and escape of William and Ellen Craft, to know that they are industrious students in a school, and attracting the attention of persons occupying the most influential positions in society. The wonderful escape of William and Ellen Craft is still fresh in the minds of all who take an interest in the cause of humanity; and their illuding the pursuit of the slave-hunters at Boston, and final escape from the Athens of the New World, will not be soon forgotten. When these two fugitives came to England, the entire press, with but one exception, spoke of them and commended their case to the sympathy of the friends of freedom; that single exception was the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, edited by Mr. John Scoble. To this day, the *Reporter* has never mentioned the names of these poor fugitives. The reason is obvious. William and Ellen, on reaching New England, after their perilous escape, became acquainted with, and partook of the hospitality of, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, and this was a sin which could not be overlooked by Mr. Scoble. I hesitate not to say that the man who will let such a party feeling keep him from giving a welcome to the slave when he is exiled and in a foreign land, is not the man to be a leader among the fugitive slaves in Canada. I hope the fugitives in Canada will not fail to sound this fact in the ears of this would-be philanthropist. Let Mr. Scoble deny this fact if he can. But this is not all. The unblemished reputation of these two exiles could not shield them from the tongue of this slanderer. But more of him at an other time. Mr. Scoble embarks for Canada in a fortnight.

I am, my dear Standard, sincerely yours,

Leander.

London, August 6th, 1852.

Miscellaneous News.

Five slaves have left Mr. C. Q. Armstrong, of St. Louis—a girl of 18, a woman of 25, and three children, supposed to have been abducted by two white men.

——Mrs. Pendleton's slaves, fourteen in number, who ran off to Pennsylvania, from Washington County, Md., a few days ago, have not been arrested at Harrisburg, as reported, although they are said to be in that town.

——The Calamity at Staten Island.—The case of the deplorable calamity at the Staten Island Ferry, on the 5th of July last, is before the Grand Jury of Richmond County.

——An exchange paper says that Col. Benton, at the late election at St. Louis, received some six votes for jailor, besides several for justice of the peace, constable and coroner.

——The *Commonwealth* of Boston says: Our nominee, Senator Hale, passed through this city, Saturday, in fine spirits, *en route* for Washington. *He* will "stand the fire."

——The Negroes Leaving.—The Rockingham, Va., *Register* says that on the 4th inst., there was a considerable stampede among the negroes of Pendleton County in that State. Z. Dyer, Esq., late Clerk of the County, lost three; Cyrus Hopkins, Esq., two; and Elijah Stonestreet, one. About a year since, A. W. Dyer, of the same County, lost four of his most valuable slaves in the same way.

——The Plague in Hayti.—A Boston paper says that the brig *Medford*, with dates from Cape Haytien to the 8th inst., and the schooner *Eureka*, from Port-au-Prince, 4th inst., have arrived here. They bring accounts of the continued ravages of the plague at Port-au-Prince, but state that Mr. Wilson, the U. S. Consul at the Cape, had discovered a remedy which had saved many lives. The disordgr is described as a rotting in the stomach, which takes place in twenty-four hours if not checked by remedies. The number of natives who have died all over the Island of this disorder is very large. The number of foreign seamen that died of it at the Cape is thirteen, and many were still sick. A Hospital for foreigners has been established through the efforts of Mr. Wilson.

——"Merrimac," the Boston correspondent of the Newburyport *Herald*, states that "an experienced writer is now engaged in dramatising Uncle's Tom's Cabin, with a view to its representation upon the stage. The story is rather long, and the characters are quite numerous, but the incidents are well adapted for dramatic effect. The blending of the ludicrous with the pathetic, in the drama, has been a great element in the success of the stage; and if the dramatist of the story of Uncle Tom succeeds with anything like the tact and ability displayed by the authoress of the original story, it will put money in the treasury of the establishment at which it is produced."

——Beneficial Act.—The House of Representatives has passed the bill appropriating ten millions of acres of public land for the support of indigent insane persons, in the States of the Union—the lands to be distributed among them in due proportion. *The Intelligencer* says:

"Should this beneficent measure receive the sanction of the Senate—as we devoutly hope it may—it will of itself give a lasting distinction to the Thirty second Congress; and what an enduring monument will it be to the benign influence of Woman, and to the humane, the gentle yet energetic being (Miss Dix), in particular, to whose persevering exertions this noble gift to humanity will be due!"

——A Bonaparte in the American Army.—A promotion of forty-three cadets of the Military Academy at West Point has just taken place in the United States Army. We remark among the number the name of the cadet Jerome Napoleon Bonaparte, who was No. 11 in his class at the time of the examination, and who is appointed to the regiment of mounted riflemen. He is the grandson of Jerome Bonaparte, brother of the Emperor of Napoleon, Ex-King of Westphalia, and now President of the French Senate. His grandmother, Madame Patterson, first wife of Prince Jerome, resides in Baltimore. It will be recollected the marriage of Jerome with Miss Patterson would not be recognised by Napoleon, and was therefore declared unlawful and void.

——The tricks to which the Massachusetts men resort to get a drink of rum are remarkable. Those who happen to live near the line, which for miles divides Massachusetts from New Hampshire, escape the rigorous operation of the liquor law, by stepping over, and thus beyond its jurisdiction. A number of liquor dealers have recently taken up their abode in Pelham and other places in New Hampshire, within half an hour's ride. One individual has bought a piece of land, in that State, and put upon it a building, so contrived that his bar stands exactly up to the line in New Hampshire, while his customers, as they hold the glass to the mouth, drink in Massachusetts! This is a dodge potential, which the law cannot touch.

——In Deep Affliction.—The Rev. Hubbard Winslow, in his speech at the Webster meeting last evening, declared that he had passed many sleepless hours in his bed, "and found his pillow bathed with tears." Had the Rev. Gentleman been alive in Jeremiah's time, that melancholy prophet would not have raised his lament, "Oh that mine head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears," for he might have taken Hubbard's head and been supplied in all his wants.—*Boston Daily Herald.*

——The Golden Rule, with Illustrations.—The attention of the Broadway perambulators has been much occupied for the last two weeks, with daily growth of a massive, and apparently superfluous brick wall against the side of the building which bounds the premises of the Grace Church parsonage on the north. For a long time no one could divine, what the transcendentalists call "the mission" of this wall. Its erection in the vicinity of the church, and under the auspices of its reverend pastor, led the more superstitious to suppose it had some mysterious purpose, like that which provoked the confusion of tongues and the dispersion of the races, some four thousand years ago or more, in the plains of Shinar. This theory, however, did not obtain to any considerable extent, as the base of the wall was not quite broad enough to support a structure which was designed to be employed in scaling the heavens. Others supposed it was intended as a partial support of a roof to protect the graceful proportions of the wooden steeple which adorns the adjacent church, from being visited by the winds of heaven too roughly. The absence of any preparation for a similar support on the south, has proved nearly fatal to that hypothesis. While the public has thus been agitated by these and other conflicting theories, a friend of ours has had the rare sagacity to seek for information of the parties who possessed it, and he has favoured us with a key to the solemn mystery. It seems that the reverend pastor's profane neighbour on the north, erected a large edifice on his premises, with windows in the side overlooking the pastor's front yard, thus violating that privacy which it is his pleasure that none should share but his guests and the locomotory population of Broadway.

Regardless, however, of these well known wishes and expectatations, the neighbour on the north proceeded to curtail the rights and privileges of the aforesaid guests and of the citizens of New York generally who walk in Broadway as far up as Tenth street, by piercing his south wall and putting windows into them, so that any hour of the day or night the fair Juliets, occupying his premises, might contemplate the flowers in our pastor's front yard or the stately proportion of his church's wooden steeple, with the same freedom precisely as any other person could who happened to be in Broadway at the time, and legally entitled to indulge in such contemplations.

Thereupon the church in its militant capacity at once resolved to teach its pastor's profane neighbour on the north, by example, the importance of observing that divine precept which directs us all to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us. The church wanted him to build his boundary wall without windows; he negl

Miscellaneous Department.

DISCOVERERS DISCOVERED.

[OUR able representative at the Swedish court [says the *Home Journal*] is Francis Shroeder, of Rhode Island, and he has availed himself of the opportunity afforded by his residence in Sweden to make researches in Icelandic and other Scandinavian literature. He has discovered in Icelandic chronicles *several* narratives, agreeing with one another in all material points, of expeditions to the American continent, centuries before Columbus was born. He is engaged in writing a Scandinavian history, in which the substance of these narratives will be given, and their authenticity established. Meanwhile, he has written a letter to friends here, giving an outline of the story. Of this letter, printed in the *Washington Republic*, the following narrative is the most important part.]

Once upon a time there was a man—a Norwegian—whose name was Heriolf, and who, with his son Biarn, sailed about in ships, and trafficked from land to land. He was descended from Earl Ingolf, who, more than a hundred years before, had founded the colony of Iceland, and, like the Vikings of his native Norway, Heriolf and his son were most at home upon the stormy sea. By some strange accident, they were once and for the first time separated. The pious Biarn, in search like a Northern Telemachus, wandered about in vain from port to port, and at length turned his restless prow to far away Greenland. Steering by the stars, and groping about the wide waste of ocean with such experience as men in those old days could have (it was exactly eight hundred and fifty-one years ago), the bold Biarn at first sailed with prosperous gales; but a fierce storm succeeding, drove him miles and miles away to the south and west, and nearly wrecked him on a wide, flat and woody coast, which the rover knew could not be Greenland. A vast summer-looking cape lay invitingly on his larboard bow, but the long-prayed for southwest wind had risen like another Mentor, and Biarn, shutting out temptation, bore away for Greenland's icy mountains. Reward followed close upon his self-denial, and he was locked in his father's arms. Meantime our friend Biarn had seen, and was the first of Europeans to see, AMERICA; but Heriolf and his son, thrifty traders both, had ever found the oceans and the shores their fathers had known, quite vast enough for them, and were therefore well content to ship a cargo for a homeward voyage. Leif, however, an Iceland noble, and son to the red Eric, resolved to pursue the adventure. His father, Earl Eric, twenty years before, had been driven from the peaceful colony in Iceland because of his bloody hand. Collecting his sons and his liegemen, he sailed boldly away to the west, eight hundred miles and more, and entered at last a deep bay, which he called Eric's fiord, and named the land around him Greenland. Finding the new region as good as Iceland, he sent his son Leif to Norway, with messages to King Olaf, describing the magnificence of Greenland. The King, who was already a Christian, having received from Lief the promise of his father's and of his own conversion, sent them forth assistance—men, provisions, missionaries, and finally a bishop, so that churches and convents were built in Greenland. In a word, the Greenland colony was quite able to take up the unfinished adventures of Biarn, and Lief was the champion. His aged father himself would have headed the enterprise, but his horse stumbled as he rode to the ship, and the Northman eight hundred years ago was warned by the omen. Leif, however, bestrode a surer-footed steed, and embarked all undaunted. His ship, manned with a crew of thirty-five fearless rovers, sailed away through the maiden waves of the west, and Biarn's land of promise rose to the sight. It was Newfoundland, but the Northmen called it Helleland, and, unsatisfied with its flat aspect, turned southward to pleasanter coasts, and landed in Nova Scotia, naming it Markland, the land of the plains. The favoured ship, speeding with the breeze, coasted along beautiful and shady regions, with corn and fruit growing wild in the fields, a paradise land to the Northmen. Rivers and lakes teeming with fish, and an atmosphere soft and balmy in the "Skordemaden" (the harvest moon of the year), filled the measure of temptation, and the Northmen built their cabins for the winter.

The ship was moored, and all hands busy on shore. One day a German sailor named Tyrker, from Rhinland, wandered off in the charming fields, and came upon tall clustering vines bending with rich clusters of graps; he seized an armful of the ripest, and hastened to teach the Northmen how, on the hill-sides of his native river, men made the sparkling wine. "Vinland!" cried Lief, "a deep Skoal for Vinland!" and Vinland thenceforward was the Northman's name for our modern isles of Rhode Island. The old authors thought the baptism unfortunate, spite of groves and the halcyon verdure of the fields: the old authors were right—for the wild grape broke the promises of Tyrker.

Leif returned in the spring to Greenland; the winter had been far milder than his men had ever known before, and so rapturous was the general report, that Thorwald, Leif's brother, embarked the some year. He passed his winter in the cabins of Lief, and in the summer months made excursions into the country, discovering an archipelago of little islands with leafy groves along the white shelving beaches; but nowhere traces of man or beast, excepting a single strange wood-pile, in form like a pyramid. A second winter was comfortable in the old quarters, and when spring came again the ship was found to be so much disabled that half of the summer was required for repairing; a new keel was needed, and the place of the sturdy shipwrights was named *Kiellarnaes*—the cape of the keel.

At length all was ready, and the helm was put up for a cruise to the eastward. They sailed along shore in calm summer seas, and attracted, one day, by the beauty of a deep fiord, the ship was brought to and anchored. Thorwald pulled ashore with a boat's crew, and was amazed to discover, moored in a shady spot, three birchen canoes, with a red man sleeping in each. Imprudently and barbarously he gave instant orders for their death. One, however, dashed with swift paddle-strokes across the fiord, swifter than the flight of Thorwald's javelin; and when the Northmen reposed in their turn, fleets of the red men covered the little bay, the cliff-echoes rang startled with war songs, barbed arrows and darts hurled through the air, but fell harmless and blunted. The Northmen braved the storm with their stout bucklers of hide.

The savages, whom Thorwald contemptuously names *Skralingues* (puny men), and who are thus known in all the Norwegian ballads and chronicles, believed it vain to contend against invulnerable strangers, and, after an hour's conflict, were seized with panic, and fled. They had done more mischief, however, than was ever known to themselves. One fatal arrow revenged their murdered comrades, and struck down Thorwald himself with a mortal wound. "Let the cross," said the dying rover (the chroniclers thus make him a Christian), "let the cross of the Saviour be laid on my grave;" and his tomb was built on the headland *Kors-naes*, the cape of the cross.

The survivors bore home the sad news to Greenland, whereupon Thorwald's son Thorsten (both names are from the Scandinavian, god of war) resolved to recover the body of his father. He embarked early in the year 1006, and took with him his wife, the beauteous Gudrida, who was destined, but not with young Thorsten, to be the first of European females to cross the ocean, and to bear upon its further shore a Christian child. With Thorsten, however, all was unfortunate. Tempest-tossed and driven irrecoverably northward, his ship was thrown far back in Baffin's Bay, upon a coast so far remote that he was forced to winter in a fatal clime. Thorsten himself and more than half of his crew fell victims to exposure; but happily Gudrida returned and laid her husband's body in the Christian's tomb in Greenland.

Next year the most considerable expedition of all was undertaken by a wealthy Icelander, Thorfin, whose genealogy is carefully preserved by the chroniclers. He arrived in Greenland with a numerous retinue in 1007, and having espoused the disconsolate Gudrida, became possessed of Thorsten's right to all the establishments in Narraganstett Bay. He set sail propitiously with bride and five attendant bridemaids. His cargo was a precious collection of domestic animals, cattle and sheep, and he had tools and weapons, and abundant provision. His ship, moreover, was manned with sixty picked Norwegians—men whose nerves were strung amid the dangers of their own Maelstrom, and whose reckless spirits could never brook King Olaf's home reforms.

The voyage was in everything prosperous, the landing was safely effected, and the summer was passed in establishing themselves for winter. The cattle and the sheep roamed in the pastures, and a young bull throve so prodigiously that his strength and ferocity surpassed everything the Northmen had ever seen. In the spring came the Skrœlingues with precious skins and furs to traffic, but fled away, dismayed at the frightful roar of the bull. They came back, however, encouraged, and Thorfin prudently commanded that no weapons whatever be sold them. Gudrida and her women offered cheese and sweet milk, and in return received from the delighted Skrœlingues their most valued commodities. Quarrels, however, could not be avoided. The savages were forced to retire, and the Northmen had to guard their cabins with stockades.

Three happy years were passed in tranquillity. The visits of the Skrœlingues became peaceful, and in the summer of the fourth year, leaving the colony prosperous, Thorfin and Gudrida, with the little Snorro, their Vinland-born son, returned to Iceland. A splendid cargo was sold. Crowds of volunteers offered to go back with them, and many successful and prosperous voyages were made. Finally, Thorfin gave the direction of Vinland affairs to other chiefs, and spent his later days in Iceland, where he lived in an antique hall like a lagman of Norway. He died in a green old age, and Gudrida, after a pilgrimage to Rome, returned to a cloister and church which her son Snorro had built on the lands of his father, and piously devoted the remainder of her days to God.

Thus and thus runs the tale of ancient mariners Norway; and thus and thus the old chronicles, read nightly aloud to the family circle, delight the long winter evenings of modern Norwegians. Different authors give the narratives with marvellous uniformity; but they appear, more minutely than elsewhere, in the so-called "Manuscript of Flatey"—written, its author asserts, from the words of Thorfin himself. Iceland historians of later dates speak abundantly of Vinland, but, as the expeditions after that of Thorfin varied little from his, the chroniclers contented themselves with describing more minutely those only which are remarkable. One, whom the critics have considered among the most authentic, relates the story of a Saxon priest, Johan, who went to Vinland a missionary, and was there condemned to death. In 1121, a Greenland bishop named Eric undertook the same errand, but his fate appears never to have been known, and, indeed, from this period Vinland was gradually forgotten. The colony of Thorfin does not appear to have been much reinforced after his death. His successors explored more southerly coasts, and landed in New York and New Jersey. War broke out in Narragansett with the Skrœlingues, and, notwithstanding the superior arms and defences of the colonists, the little band gradually wasted away; but not before they had built such monuments on the Rhode Island coasts as will puzzle antiquaries in centuries to come.

The expeditions of the Northmen were not confined to the southern latitudes. In 1266, led on by their priests, they penetrated Barrow's Straits and Lancaster Sound, not, perhaps, in search of a northwest passage, but to pick up drift-wood, as they thought, from Siberia, and to kill sea-bears and whales. At length Greenland was swept by the plague, a few straggling survivers were murdered by the natives, and although Pope Nicholas V. appointed a bishop to Greenland in 1448, the chroniclers of the north were dumb a hundred years before. Iceland had fallen from her high estate; she was a tributary, dependant upon foreign kings, and all that her enterprise and the indomitable courage of her Northmen heroes had found on the western oceans, sunk deep below the horizon of human knowledge, until again brought up by an immortal hero from the south, like "drowned honour, by the locks."

MAGNETISM IN ITS EARLY STAGES.

[From Makays' "Memoirs of Extraordinary Delusions and The Madness of Crowds."]

"As this new doctrine of magnetism spread, it was found that wounds inflicted with any metallic substance could be cured by the magnet. In process of time, the delusion so increased, that it was deemed sufficient to magnetise a sword, to cure any hurt which that sword might have inflicted! This was the origin of the celebrated 'weapon-salve,' which excited so much attention about the middle of the seventeenth century. The following was the recipe given by Paracelsus for the cure of any wounds inflicted by a sharp weapon, except such as had penetrated the heart, the brain, or the arteries: 'Take of moss growing on the head of a thief who has been hanged and left in the air; of real mummy; of human blood, still warm—of each, one ounce; of human suet, two ounces; of linseed oil, turpentine, and Armenian bole—of each, two drachms. Mix all well in a mortar, and keep the salve in an oblong, narrow urn.' With this salve the weapon, after being dipped in the blood from the wound, was to be carefully anointed, and then laid by in a cool place. In the meantime, the wound was to be duly washed with fair clean water, covered with a clean, soft, linen rag, and opened once a-day to cleanse off purulent or other matter. Of the success of this treatment, says the writer of the able article on Animal Magnetism, in the twelfth volume of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, there cannot be the least doubt; 'for surgeons at this moment follow exactly the same method, *except* anointing the weapon!'

"The weapon-salve continued to be much spoken of on the Continent, and many eager claimants appeared for the honour of the invention. Dr. Fludd, or A. Fluctibus, the Rosicrucian, who has been already mentioned in a previous part of this volume, was very zealous in introducing it into England. He tried it with great success in several cases, and no wonder, for while he kept up the spirits of his patients by boasting of the great efficacy of the salve, he never neglected those common, but much more important remedies, of washing, bandaging, &c., which the experience of all ages had declared sufficient for the purpose. Fludd moreover declared that the magnet was a remedy for all diseases, it properly applied; but that man having, like the earth, a north and a south pole, magnetism could only take place when his body was in a boreal position! In the midst of his popularity, an attack was made upon him and his favourite remedy—the salve; which, however, did little or nothing to diminish the belief in its efficacy. One 'Parson Foster' wrote a pamphlet, entitled 'Hyplocrisma Spongus; or, a Spunge to wipe away the Weapon-Salve;' in which he declared that it was as bad as witchcraft to use or recommend such an unguent; that it was invented by the devil, who, at the last day, would seize upon every person who had given it the slightest encouragement. 'In fact,' said Parson Foster, "the devil himself gave it to Paracelsus; Paracelsus to the emperor; the emperor to the courtier; the courtier to Baptista Porta; and Baptista Porta to Dr. Fludd, a doctor of physic, yet living and practising in the famous city of London, who now stands tooth and nail for it.' Dr. Fludd, thus assailed, took up the pen in defence of his unguent, in a reply called 'The Squeezing of Parson Foster's Spunge;' wherein the Spunge-bearer's immodest carriage and behaviour towards his brethren is detected; the bitter flames of his slanderous reports are, by the sharp vinegar of truth, corrected and quite extinguished; and lastly, the virtuous validity of his spunge in wiping away the weapon-salve, is crushed out and clean abolished.'

"Shortly after this dispute, a more distinguished believer in the weapon-salve made his appearance in the person of Sir Kenelm Digby, the son of Sir Everard Digby, who was executed for his participation in the Gunpowder Plot. This gentleman, who, in other respects, was an accomplished scholar and an able man, was imbued with all the extravagant notions of the alchymists. He believed in the philosopher's stone, and wished to engage Descartes to devote his energies to the discovery of the elixir of life, or some other means by which the existence of man might be prolonged to an indefinite period. He gave his wife, the beautiful Venetia Anastasia Stanley, a dish of capons fed upon vipers, according to the plan supposed to have been laid down by Arnold of Villeneuve, in the hope she might thereby preserve her loveliness for a century. If such a man once took up the idea of the weapon-salve, it was to be expected that he would make the most of it. In his hands, however, it was changed from an unguent into a powder, and was called the *powder of sympathy*. He pretended that he had acquired the knowledge of it from a Carmelite friar, who had learned it in Persia or Amenia, from an oriental philosopher of great renown. King James, the Prince of Wales, the Duke of Buckingham, and many other noble personages, believed in its efficacy. The following remarkable instance of his mode of cure was read by Sir Kenelm to a society of learned men at Montpellier. Mr. James Howell, the well-known author of the 'Dendrologia,' and of various letters, coming by chance as two of his best friends were fighting a duel, rushed between them and endeavoured to part them. He seized the sword of one of the combatants by the hilt, while, at the same time, he grasped the other by the blade. Being transported with fury one against the other, they struggled to rid themselves of the hindrance caused by their friend; and, in doing so, the one whose sword was held by the blade by Mr. Howell, drew it away roughly, and nearly cut his hand off, severing the nerves and muscles, and penetrating to the bone. The other, almost at the same instant, disengaged his sword, and aimed a blow at the head of his antagonist, which Mr. Howell observing, raised his wounded hand with the rapidity of thought to prevent the blow. The sword fell on the back of his already wounded hand, and cut it severely. 'It seemed,' said Sir Kenelm Digby, 'as if some unlucky star raged over them, that they should have both shed the blood of that dear friend for whose life they would have given their own, if they had been in their proper mind at the time.' Seeing Mr. Howell's face all besmeared with blood from his wounded hand, they both threw down their swords and embraced him, and bound up his hand with a garter, to close the veins which were cut and bled profusely. They then conveyed him home, and sent for a surgeon. King James, who was much attached to Mr. Howell, afterwards sent his own surgeon to attend him. We must continue the narrative in the words of Sir Kenelm Digby: 'It was my chance,' says he, 'to be lodged hard by him; and four or five days after, as I was making myself ready, he came to my house, and prayed me to view his wounds. 'For I understand,' said he, 'that you have extraordinary remedies on such occasions; and my surgeons apprehend some fear that it may grow to a gangrene, and so the hand must be cut off.' In effect, his countenance discovered that he was in much pain, which, he said, was insupportable in regard of the extreme inflammation. I told him I would willingly serve him; but if, haply, he knew the manner how I could cure him, without touching or seeing him, it might be that he would not expose himself to my manner of curing; because he would think it, peradventure, either ineffectual or superstitious. He replied, 'The many wonderful things which people have related unto me of your way of medicinement makes me nothing doubt at all of its efficacy; and all that I have to say unto you is comprehended in the Spanish proverb, "Hagase el milagro y hagalo Mahoma"—Let the miracle be done, though Mahomet do it.'

"'I asked him then for anything that had the blood upon it: so he presently sent for his garter, wherewith his hand was first bound; and as I called for a basin of water, as if I would wash my hands, I took a handful of powder of vitriol, which I had in my study, and presently dissolved it. As soon as the bloody garter was brought me, I put it in the basin, observing, in the interim, what Mr. Howell did, who stood talking with a gentleman in a corner of my chamber, not regarding at all what I was doing. He started suddenly, as if he had found some strange alteration in himself. I asked him what he ailed? "I know not what ails me, but I find that I feel no more pain. Methinks that a pleasing kind of freshness, as it were a wet cold napkin, did spread over my hand, which hath taken away the inflammation that tormented me before." I replied, "since, then, you feel already so much good of my medicament, I advise you to cast away all your plasters; only keep the wound clean, and in a moderate temper betwixt heat and cold." This was presently reported to the Duke of Buckingham, and, a little after, to the king, who were both very curious to know the circumstances of the business; which was, that after dinner I took the garter out of the water, and put it to dry before a great fire. It was scare dry before Mr. Howell's servant came running, and saying that his master felt as much burning as ever he had done, if not more; for the heat was such as if his hand were betwixt coals of fire. I answered that, although that had happened at present, yet he should find ease in a short time; for I knew the reason of this new accident, and would provide accordingly; for his master should be free from that inflammation, it might be before he could possibly return to him. But, in case he found no ease, I wished him to come presently back again; if not, he might forbear coming. Thereupon he went, and, at the instant I put the garter again into the water; thereupon he found his master without any pain at all. To be brief, there was no sense of pain afterwards; but within five or six days the wounds were cicatrised and entirely healed.'

"Such is the marvellous story of Sir Kenelm Digby. Other practitioners of that age were not behind him in their pretensions. It was not always thought necessary to use either the powder of sympathy or the weapon-salve to effect a cure. It was sufficient to magnetise the sword with the hand (the first faint dawn of the *animal* theory), to relieve any pain the same weapon had caused. They asserted, that if they stroked the sword *upwards* with their fingers, the wounded person would feel immediate relief; but if they stroked it *downwards* he would feel intolerable pain."

[How the first stage of animal magnetism in England terminated, Mackay thus relates.]

"So much curiosity was excited by the subject, that, about the same time, a man named Holloway gave a course of lectures on animal magnetism in London, at the rate of five guineas for each pupil, and realized a considerable fortune. Loutherbourg the painter and his wife followed the same profitable trade; and such was the infatuation of the people to be witnesses of their strange manipulations, that at times upwards of three thousand persons crowded around their house at Hammersmith, unable to gain admission. The tickets sold at prices varying from one to three guineas. Loutherbourg performed his cures by the touch, after the manner of Valentine Greatraks, and finally pretended to a divine mission. An account of his miracles, as they were called, was published in 1789, entitled *A List of New Cures performed by Mr. and Mrs. de Loutherbourg, of Hammersmith-terrace, without Medicine; by a Lover of the Lamb of God. Dedicated to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

"This 'Lover of the Lamb of God,' was a half-crazy old woman, named Mary Pratt, who conceived for Mr. and Mrs. Loutherbourg a veneration which almost prompted her to worship them. She chose for the motto of her pamphlet a verse in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles: 'Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish! for I will work a work in your days which ye shall not believe, though a man declare it unto you.' Attempting to give a religious character to the cures of the painter, she thought a *woman* was the proper person to make them known, since the apostle had declared that a *man* should not be able to conquer the incredulity of the people. She stated that from Christmas, 1788, to July, 1789, De Loutherbourg and his wife had cured two thousand people 'having been made *proper recipients to receive divine manuductions;* which heavenly and divine influx, coming from the radix *God*, his Divine Majesty had most graciously bestowed upon them to diffuse healing to all, be they deaf, dumb, blind, lame, or halt.'

"In her dedication to the Archbishop of Canterbury she implored him to compose a new form of prayer, to be used in all churches and chapels, that nothing might impede this inestimable gift from having its due course. She further entreated all the magistrates and men of authority in the land to wait on Mr. and Mrs. de Loutherbourg, to consult with them on the immediate erection of a large hospital, with a pool of Bethseda attached to it. All the magnetisers were scandalised at the preposterous jabber of this old woman, and De Loutherbourg appears to have left London to avoid her—continuing, however, in conjunction with his wife, the fantastic tricks which had turned the brain of this poor fanatic, and deluded many others who pretended to more sense than she had.

"From this period until 1798 magnetism excited little or no attention in England. An attempt to revive the belief in it was made in that year, but it was in the shape of 'mineral rather than of animal magnetism. One Benjamin Douglas Perkins, an American, practising as a surgeon in Leicester-square, invented and took out a patent for the celebrated 'Metallic Tractors.' He pretended that these tractors, which were two small pieces of metal strongly magnetised, something resembling the steel plates first brought into notice by Father Hell, would cure gout, rheumatism, palsy, and, in fact, almost every disease the human frame was subject to, if applied externally to the afflicted part, and moved about gently, touching the surface only. The most wonderful stories soon obtained general circulation, and the press groaned with pamphlets, all vaunting the curative effects of the tractors, which were sold at five guineas the pair. Perkins gained money rapidly. Gouty subjects forgot their pains in the presence of this new remedy; the rheumatism fled at its approach; and toothache, which is often cured by the mere sight of a dentist, vanished before Perkins and his marvellous steel-plates. The benevolent Society of Friends, of whose body he was a member, warmly patronized the invention. Desirous that the poor, who could not afford to pay Mr. Perkins five guineas, or even five shillings, for his tractors, should also share in the benefits of that sublime discovery, they subscribed a large sum, and built an hospital, called the 'Perkinean Institution,' in which all comers might be magnetised free of cost. In the course of a few months they were in very general use, and their lucky inventor in possession of five thousand pounds.

"Dr. Haygarth, an eminent physician at Bath, recollecting the influence of imagination in the cure of disease, hit upon an expedient to try the real value of the tractors. Perkins's cures were too well established to be doubted; and Dr. Haygarth, without gainsaying them, quietly, but in the face of numerous witnesses, exposed the delusion under which people laboured with respect to the curative medium. He suggested to Dr. Falconer that they should make wooden tractors, paint them to resemble the steel ones, and see if the very same effects would not be produced. Five patients were chosen from the hospital in Bath upon whom to operate. Four of them suffered severely from chronic rheumatism in the ankle, knee, wrist, and hip; and the fifth had been afflicted for several months with the gout. On the day appointed for the experiments, Dr. Haygarth and his friends assembled at the hospital, and, with much solemnity brought forth the fictitious tractors. Four out of the five patients said their pains were immediately relieved; and three of them said they were not only relieved but very much benefitted. One felt his knee warmer, and said he could walk across the room. He tried and succeeded, although on the previous day he had not been able to stir. The gouty man felt his pains diminish rapidly, and was quite easy for nine hours, until he went to bed, when the twitching began again. On the following day the real tractors were applied to all the patients, when they described their symptoms in nearly the same terms.

"To make still more sure the experiment was tried in the Bristol Infirmary, a few weeks afterwards, on a man who had a rheumatic affection in the shoulder, so severe as to incapaciate him from lifting his hand from his knee. The fictitious tractors were brought and applied to the afflicted part, one of the physicians, to add solemnity to the scene, drawing a stop-watch from his pocket to calculate the time exactly, while another, with a pen in his hand, sat down to write the change of symptoms from minute to minute as they occurred. In less than four minutes the man felt so much relieved that he lifted his hand several inches without any pain in the shoulder!

"An account of these matters was published by Dr. Haygarth, in a small volume entitled, *Of the Imagination, as a Cause and Cure of Disorders, exemplified by Fictitious Tractors.* The exposure was a *coup de grace* to the system of Mr. Perkins. His friends and patrons, still unwilling to confess that they had been deceived, tried the tractors upon sheep, cows, and horses, alleging that the animals received benefit from the metallic plates, but none at all from the wooden ones. But they found nobody to believe them; the Perkinean Institution fell into neglect; and Perkins made his exit from England, carrying with him about ten thousand pounds, to soothe his declining years in the good city of Pennsylvania.

"Thus was magnetism laughed out of England for a time."

"UNCLE TOM."

IN the many criticisms on Mrs. Stowe's great work, no objection is so common as that of exaggeration, or overdrawing in the *finale* of Uncle Tom's death. All who read the newspapers agree that whippings to death do occur, but all will not or cannot believe that any one, *for conscience's sake*, has died by the lash here, in this glorious nineteenth century. Those "niggers" who are whipped to death are desperate characters—persons who have worn out the patience of overseers and masters by crime and laziness.

Well, in the summer of 1839, we were in Louisville, Ky. As no great change has ever taken place in our opinion on this Slavery question, we were at some loss then for a place to go to preaching, and used on Sabbath to walk out to a grave-yard, or into the fields, or up and down the streets in search of sermons. One forenoon passing a little frame church, on Walnut street, if we remember rightly, we heard the voices of a congregation singing. Brother Samuel who with us—it was farther down street than would have been thought safe for a woman to walk alone at mid-day—said it was a congregation of Methodists, and a missionary station he thought, but assured us he had once dropped in and heard a sermon he liked.

We went in and took a seat. A plain looking elderly man preached in the style usual for Methodist preachers in country places—all about religion, its comforts in life and triumphs in death. Like Uncle Tom he insisted, with great earnestness, that it was "a great thing to be a christian." Religion—it made the weak strong, and the meanest most honourable. To illustrate this grand truth he told an anecdote as something coming within the range of his own knowledge, of an old slave who had 'got religion.' His master was kind but irreligious and reckless, and was withal much impressed by the earnestness of his servant's prayers and exhortations. But one day, one evil day, on Sabbath too, this same kind master was drinking and playing cards with a visiter when the conversation turned upon the religion of slaves. The visiter boasted that he could "whip the religion out of any 'nigger' in the State, in half an hour."

The master, proud of possessing a rare specimen, boasted that he had one, out of whom the religion could not be whipped. A bet was laid and the martyr summoned. A fearful oath of recantation and blasphemous denial of his Saviour was required of the old disciple upon pain of being whipped to death. The answer was, "Bress de Lord, massa! I can't!"

Threats, oaths, entreaties, and noise were tried, but he fell on his knees, and holding up his hands plead, "Bress de Lord Massa, I can't! Jesus, he die for me! Massa, please Massa, I can't."

The executioner summoned his aids, the old man was tied up, and the whipping commenced; but the shrieks for mercy were all intermingled with prayers and praises—prayers for his own soul and those of his murderers. When fainting and revived, the terms of future freedom from punishment were offered again, and again he put them away with the continued exclamation "Jesus, he die for me! Bress de Lord, Massa, I can't!"

The bet was to the full value of the property endangered. The men were flushed with wine, and the experimenter on "nigger religion" insisted upon "trying it out." Honour demanded he should have a fair chance to win his bet, and the old disciple died under the lash blessing the Lord that Jesus had died for him!

The preacher gave his recital with many tears, and before he was done we do not think there was a dry eye, except our own, in the house. Our pulses all stood still with horror, but the speaker did not appear to dream that his story had any bearing against the institution with which he was surrounded.

We cannot remember how he said the particulars came to his knowledge, but think the martyr had been under his pastoral care, and that he got the minute from slave witnesses in "love-feast."

He gave us the story simply to show what a good thing religion was. Of those who heard it, we found not one who appeared to doubt it. Any indignation felt and expressed was against the individual actors in the tragedy.

This, and the account we gave years ago of the old man "born in Pennsylvania and free when twenty eight!" who told us his own story of his beautiful, 'Misses Jenny' and her bad husband, who sold him South by treachery; of his telling his own story of being "born in Pennsylvania and free," and being consequently sold and resold eight times; of his seven good masters, and the cruel one who gave him the scars he exhibited to make him quit going to meeting, and curse God and Jesus Christ; of his present happiness in having found Misses Jenny and the prospect of going with her "home to Virginny"—these things convince us that there have been more Uncle Toms' in these United States than we of the North have ever dreamed of in our philosophy.

There are to-day, as there have been in all ages, thousands of wicked men, thousands of fanatics who would, if they had the power, punish with fine, imprisonment, stripes, fire and the rack, the heretic who differs from them in opinion. What, then, could be expected when one class holds irresponsible power over the lives of another? Just, that some of them will be very ready to use it.—*Mrs. Swisshelm in The Pittsburg Visiter.*

ON GOOD TERMS WITH DEATH.—In the Southern part of Tonquin, the highest compliment you can pay to a distinguished personage, and the dearest token of esteem for a revered friend, is the present of a coffin. A number of Catholic Priests, of native origin, joined in giving a coffin, as a New-Year's present, to the Bishop of Laranda, who had instructed them in theology, saying that he was growing old, and they could never have a more suitable opportunity to offer him that necessary piece of furniture. At the same time they called his attention to the excellence of the wood and the beauty of the work. Such is the custom of the country; no person who has reached the age of fifty is without his coffin, which not only stands ready for its prospective use, but serves even now, as a table by day and a bed by night. The children of a family in good circumstances will combine to offer handsome coffins to their father and mother, and pupils make the same present to a venerated teacher. Death there has no terrors. A poor widower, with young children, fell dangerously sick, and the first care of his friends was to borrow a coffin for him. When this was announced to the sufferer, he trembled with joy, and asked to see the borrowed article: "Now," said he, "let me die, for if I live I shall have to return it, and who knows if I can ever procure another?" In the same spirit the friends of a dying person speak in his presence of his approaching end, and of the preparations for his funeral. The Bishop, above referred to, says that one day he visited a chatechumen, whose malady, though likely to be prolonged, was sure to end fatally, and found a woman sitting by his bed-side making the mourning clothes for the family. At the door was the carpenter, engaged in making the coffin in sight of the patient, who directed the work with the utmost particularity. These particulars we [*Tribune*] gather from a letter of the good Bishop's, to a friend in France, published in the *Journal des Debats.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

THE TRAITOR'S REWARD.—It is said that Georgey is to be, or has already been sent to the fortress of Kufstein, in the Tyrol.

——SIR EDWARD BULWER'S play (says the *Home Circle*) of "Not so Bad as we Seem," is Not so Good as we Expected.

——SOME sound beams, formed from the wood of the mulberry tree, have been found in the ruins of Nineveh, where they are supposed to have been placed at least 700 years before the birth of Christ.

——AN English paper remarks that "G. P. R. James has just written his *seventieth* novel! It bears the name [of 'Pequinillo.' The horseman has not yet parted with his old nag, but drives him down a steep hill for the seventieth time!"

——THE first column of a new Crystal Palace was erected at Sydenham on the 5th inst., with appropriate ceremonies and speeches. Sir Joseph Paxton made one of the speeches. It will be a finer structure than its predecessor in Hyde Park. It is intended for a sort of permanent bazaar.

——IT is stated in *Notes and Queries* that the last sale of a slave in England, occurred in 1761. On the 31st December of that year, the following advertisement appeared in the Public Ledger: "For sale—A healthy Negro girl, aged about 15 years; speaks good English; works at her needle, washes well, does household work, and has had the small pox."

——WE learn from the *Nonconformist* of some curious masquerading in the world of books and bookmakers. A book which has just been published in this country, under the superintendence of the well-known Rev. T. Binney, entitled "Incidents and Memories of the Christian Life; under the Similitude of a Voyage to the Celestial Land," appeared in America under the title of "A Reel in a Bottle for Jack in the Doldrums. By an Old Salt!"

——MADEIRA.—It seems not improbable that the celebrated wine of this beautiful island will become a matter of history alone. A blight of some sort has entirely destroyed the vintage for this year, and seems likely to destroy the vines themselves. It appears in the shape of a thick white powder, which entirely covers the clusters of grapes. The inhabitants have memorialized the Portuguese Government to be permitted to cultivate tobacco.

——"THE late Mr. Clay," says a London paper, "when in conversation with the Abolitionist, Mr. Gerrit Smith, of Peterboro' some years since, when asked if he held slaves, answered in words which contain a history of his character and his course: 'Yes,' said he, regretfully, '*I have floated down with the current.*' It cannot be said of Clay, as it was said of Wilberforce, by Lamartine, that 'he *went up to the throne of God with a million of broken fetters* in his hands, as evidence of a life well spent.'"

——"ROBERT PEEL," THE CALICO PRINTER.—A gentleman in Blackburn, has in his possession a small piece of printed calico, carefully wrapped up in paper, on the outside of which there is the following memorandum: "The block from which the enclosed cloth was printed, was the first ever cut by Robert Peel, now Sir Robert Peel, Bart., when he and his brother Jonathan, now of Accrington house, were apprentices to Thomas Yates, of Morgate-fold, Livesey, near Blackburn, with whom they were boarders."

——SOME time since, the *gobemouches* of the French capital were gratified with the sight of the tattooed head of an Indian, in the window of a curiosity-shop on the Place Carrousel, ticketed with the intelligence, that it was the head of an Indian, whose tribe killed and ate the French soldier! A companion picture, now to be seen in London, in the shop of a gunsmith, near St. Clement's church, Strand, is noticed by the *Literary Gazette.* The grisly relic is the skull of a Caffre, on the apex of which is written with a pen: "*Skull of a Caffre, killed in hand-to-hand fight by Rodger (sic) Kaffin, in the Waterkloof,* 1851!"

——THE *Globe* says that the number of dogs in Constantinople was so great a short time ago, that 3,000 were conveyed to an isle of the Bosphorus, with provisions sufficient to last three days. On the fourth day, "the Imaums ascended the minarets, and exhorted them to patience and resignation."

——IT has lately become the practice on the Austrian railways to place a looking-glass on the top of the locomotive, inclined in such a way as to enable the engine-driver to see the whole train reflected, so that he can at once stop in case of accident. The plan has just been adopted on the railway from Brussels to Antwerp.

——THE STING OF THE BEE.—In most cases, the person stung can instantaneously obtain relief by pressing on the point stung with the tube of a key. This will extract the sting and relieve the pain, and the application of aqua ammonia (common spirits of hartshorn) will immediately remove it. The poison being of an acid nature is at once neutralized by the application of this penetrating and volatile alkali. A small quantity introduced into the wound on the point of a needle or fine nibbed and applied as soon as possible, will scarcely ever fail.

——HER MAJESTY'S HOUSEKEEPING.—"Do you think," said Mr. Denison, M.P., at Wakefield, "that her Majesty is anxious that her sugar should cost her 10d. per lb., when she can get it for 5d.? I can assure you, and I do not speak out of the book, that her Majesty pays her bills as regularly as any man I address [applause]. Nay, I tell you more: she knows the price of every article she orders before she orders it. She does not order on credit, and take the chance of being able to pay; and she sets her subjects in this respect, as in many others, a most excellent example, which I wish they would all follow" [cheers].

In an essay by Mr. Bell, just republished from the "Journal of Design and Manufactures," there is a curiosity in the shape of a table for "registering the *per-centage* of the different qualities of mental sensation with which we may be impressed!" Taking 100 to represent the sum of all the feelings excited by any given object, the various degrees in which "the four primary sensations" enter into the whole are represented by numbers. Thus, "Gulliver's Travels" is said to produce a compound feeling, consisting of 40 parts of the pleasing, 30 of the low or ridiculous, and 20 [40?] of the unpleasing. "What class of feelings," asks the *Athenæum*, "will this table produce in sober minds?"

——AN English paper tells the following story on the authority of a clergyman who recently made the tour of the States: "Some time ago, a slave girl of Charleston, United States, who had heard from her mistress's lips the fatal words, 'When I die, you shall be free,' took care that her mistress should begin to die directly. She poisoned her by infintesimal doses of arsenic for months, extending to years. The discovery was made in time to prevent the victim dying immediately, though she could never fully recover. What was done in this case of most deliberate and most malignant murder? The affair was not known among the negroes, so the lady *sold the girl into another State.* While turning over the prisoner to fresh opportunities, and pocketing the money from the slave mart, the mistress claimed credit from the passing stranger for mercy and magnanimity."

——SHAMEFUL WASTE OF MONEY BY A RELIGIOUS SOCIETY.—A London paper remarks: "A most reckless piece of expenditure of money has just taken place by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, a society which collects large sums annually from the public, for the avowed purpose of sending missionaries to the colonies and dependencies of the British crown. The society has just completed 150 years of its existence; and in order that a great show might be made at a celebration which was got up at Westminster Abbey, last Tuesday, they invited two bishops from America, paying their expenses to England and back again, as well as their [expenses] during their residence in London. Now, as these right rev. prelates came over in the best places that could be provided for them, and as they have been sumptuously housed and fed during their stay in London, the expense could not have been less than a couple of hundred pounds on the most moderate calculation, and this to be defrayed from the funds of the society, subscribed by the public for an entirely different purpose. All this was done to make a show, and yet even the bishop of the diocese was not present at the ceremony."

——AMONG the persons who should emigrate, Punch names:

"All the younger sons of the nobility, who have not been pushed into the army or navy. As it is indispensably necessary, it seems, to have soldiers and sailors, they may as well be noblemen as not, so long as they fight well, and do not run away. But all the younger sons, who are waiting for ambassador-ships, secretary-ships, and attache-ships, and other kinds of ships on which there is no fighting, and very little work and very handsome pay, should emigrate as quickly as their debts will allow them, and see what they can do to earn a living in another country."

Also—"All Punsters and Conundrum-makers.

"All 'Wallflowers' at evening parties.

"All Widows, as being a dangerous class of the community.

"All Linendrapers, who are always coming out with 'An Alarming Failure,' or luring customers into their shops to